THE PAPACY IN POLITICS TODAY

JOSEPH McCABE

REWRIT

HOW did the Pope escape so easily after his flagrant alliance with the Nazis, the Fascists, and the Japanese in the Second World War? What lies behind the apparent reserve of the Vatican today? Mr. McCabe, the veteran authority on the Roman Church, has entirely re-written his *Papacy in Politics Today*, which had already passed through four editions, and answers these questions. The book is now a brilliant and consistent exposure of papal policy and intrigue for the last thirty years. It is much more than a mere criticism of the Church. It shows, quoting sound authority for every paragraph, that behind the dangerous world-strain of today one of the most mischievous factors is the Papacy. "Rome never changes" was long ago one of the Church's boasts. This book, written by an historian with an intimate knowledge of it, proves that, in pressing its own interest to the grave detriment of the race, it is today what it was in the Middle Ages.

2s. 6d. net

THE PAPACY IN POLITICS TODAY

BY

JOSEPH McCABE

Completely re-written

WATTS & CO.

5 & 6 JOHNSON'S COURT, FLEET STREET, LONDON, E.C.4

First published 1937
Second Edition 1939
Third edition; completely re-written, 1943
Fourth edition 1943
Reprinted 1944
Reprinted 1945
Reprinted 1947
Fifth edition; completely re-written, 1951

Printed by Richard Clay and Company, Ltd., and Published in Great Britain by
C. A. Watts & Co. Ltd., 5 & 6 Johnson's Court, Fleet Street, London, E.C.4

CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
	Preface	v
I	The Principles of Vatican Policy	1
II	Rome Courts, then Curses, Russia	9
III	The Sordid Deal in Italy	19
IV	The Tragedy of Spain and Portugal	33
V	The Deal with the Devil in Germany	40
VI	Selling Freedom in South America	53
VII	Rome Ruins Austria	62
VIII	The Vatican and Czecho-Slovakia	72
IX	The Pernicious Policy in France	82
X	Vatican Policy in the Far East	92
XI	The Poles under the Vatican	100
XII	Driving America into War	111
XIII	How British Catholics are Duped	123
	Index	133

PREFACE

THE Roman Catholic usually closes his chant about the unique virtues and glories of his Church with a reminder how a century ago Lord Macaulay predicted that it would still exist when, in a remote age, some traveller came from New Zealand to see the ruins of London. Macaulay did not say that it "will" exist but that it "may" exist, and in the same famous essay he says, in explaining the Reformation, that "the character of the Roman Church had excited the scorn and disgust of Germany." He added :—

> Our firm belief is that the North owes its great civilization and prosperity chiefly to the moral effect of the Protestant Reformation, and that the decay of the Southern countries is to be mainly ascribed to "the Great Catholic Revival."

Half a century later a more learned historian than Macaulay, Lord Acton, a Catholic, reflecting that in their struggle against the new destructive forces of the nineteenth century the Popes had reverted to the brutality of the Middle Ages, wrote that they were "more murderous than the Old Man of the Mountains"; hitherto the historic type of mass-murderer. There followed a half-century in which the Papacy seemed to have abandoned its old policy of anathema and bloodshed. Yet one of the shrewdest and most influential of social writers, H. G. Wells, gave his very wide circle of readers the measured assurance that the Church of Rome is "the most evil thing in the world today."

Wells had throughout our four decades of friendship amicably twitted me about my criticisms of the Church and had in his own works, particularly the *History of the World*, shared the common literary leniency to that organization and affected to believe that it had really been converted from its evil ways. The open complicity of the Vatican in the Second World War swept all prudential considerations from his mind and directed all the indignation of his fine character against this "enemy of the human race." In almost his last work (*Crux Ansata*) he —parenthetically, but with characteristic generosity, describing me as "the most capable critic the Papal system has ever had" —made a more bitter attack on the Church in every age than I had ever made, and he ended with the dark prophecy :—

> Before mankind gets rid of it the Papacy may be drowning our hopes for the coming generation in a welter of blood—in an attempt to achieve a final world-wide St. Bartholomew—and it will not add an inch to his stature nor alter the fact that the Pope, any Pope, is necessarily an ill-educated and foolish obstacle, a nucleus of base resistance, held to the tradition of Roman Catholicism in its last stage of poisonous decay, in the way to a better order in the world.

But death was not far from the home of my gifted friend and he did not live to see how circumstances turned the defeat of the Pope's policy in the war into a new triumph, or to work out an organic conception of a consistent Papal policy during the last thirty years. This I here propose to do. Recasting the material of my *Papacy in Politics Today*, which, with my *History of the Popes* (1939), had a large share in opening Wells's eyes, I trace this policy and the contemporary events which moulded it in each decade from the close of the First World War to the present day.

The Papacy in Politics Today was first published in 1937, a year before Hitler's rape of Austria. It was, perhaps, an exaggeration to say at that time: "Today we shudder at the monstrous shapes which darken civilization and we discuss daily the chances of a world disaster" or "it is as common to discuss the chances of a world disaster as to wrangle over the problem of unemployment." The conventional belief today is that at least until 1938, if not 1939, Mr. Churchill was a gloomy but patriotic Cassandra thundering his warnings into deaf ears. Since Mr. Churchill's only approach to the public at that time was through journalism, and his articles in the *Evening Standard* were republished in volume form, any serious inquirer can easily find that this is entirely wrong. Repeatedly and consistently he assured us that, having such strong and incorruptible allies as France (Pétain) and Mussolini, we need not fear a conflict; and in his last message (*Great Contemporaries*, 1937) he says that, while everybody knows of the war aims of Hitler ("a genius born of the miseries of Germany" he said), it is merely necessary to disarm him by concessions, and "the world lives in hopes that the worst is over and that we may yet live to see Hitler a gentler figure in a happier age." In the same year, 1937, I published in America *A History of the World since 1918*, and it concluded with an accurate statement of the annexationist programme of Italy, Germany, and Japan, an expectation of a European-Asiatic war, and a prediction of the course of that war which erred only in one important detail.

During the first three years of the war, when, owing to the

deliberate treachery, for religious reasons, of the French Catholic military leaders (as I will show), half the world expected a victory of the Fascist forces, the Pope acted so openly in alliance with them that Professor Salvemini could give overwhelming evidence of his complicity as regards Italy, and in my *Papacy in Politics* I gave it in regard to Germany and Japan. In the last year of the war the Papacy was silent; and one requires very little realistic thinking to understand why, instead of being in disgrace at the close of the war, it even found itself in cordial and most esteemed alliance with the conquerors.

In its support of Hitler and Mussolini during the years of preparation (1932-7) the Vatican had already been in virtual alliance with London, Washington, and Paris. Through Ribbentrop and his champagne-parties in Carlton Terrace men of influence had been persuaded that Hitler's sole real aim was to destroy Socialism and Communism by cleaning up the poisonous Soviet swamp from which the pest was spreading to every country. To the Vatican, Socialism, especially in its extreme Communist form, meant Atheism; and we shall see that the growth of this from 1918 to 1928 robbed the Papacy of more millions of followers than the Reformation had detached.

But Catholic theology also holds that Socialism as an attack on private property is immoral, and this linked Papal policy with that of powers to which Socialism was abhorrent because it destroys private enterprise. Thus at the close of the war the Vatican was easily allowed to represent that it had been duped by Hitler and Mussolini just as Washington and Westminster had been duped, and the force of its international organization, its coercive influence on the Press in most countries, and the voting power of its followers (especially the women) were welcomed into the service of the new Holy Alliance; provided that it would for a time replace its white-and-gold banner in the various countries of Western Europe by an innocent flag (Popular Republican Movement, Peasant's Party, Democratic Party, etc.) under which all anti-Socialist forces could rally without a blush. Even those more deadly enemies of the Papacy, the middle-class Liberals of France, Belgium, Italy, Spain, Portugal, and Latin America, were thus enabled to co-operate with it under the device of Freedom and Democracy; the social virtues which it had cost them half a million lives to win from popes and kings in the nineteenth century.

The realistic and completely independent historical science at the end of the present century will find a fascination, tempered with contempt, in that page of the human chronicle that we are writing today; the page that tells how in a scientific and humanist

age the Church of Rome could persuade statesmen and peoples to restore to it a large measure of its medieval power while it retained much of the vice and brutality of the Middle Ages.

But an alliance in which one, the secular, party seeks the material prosperity and social welfare of the people while the second party regards these as feathers in the scale against the interest of men's souls has always borne evil fruits. And when this " spiritual " partner is the Church which has had a malodorous social record for over a thousand years; the Church which insists that its power is to that of the State as the sun is to the moon; the Church which has in our time supported bestiality from the rape of Manchuria and the tragic ruin of Spain until the tide of war turned against the Fascists; the Church which stridently urges America today to begin a new war, though it is well aware that in this war it would use not only atomic super-bombs but poison-sprays and poisonous gases with which a single air fleet could in twelve hours destroy all life in an area as large as Great Britain; the Church which masks its aim by the pretence that it supremely promotes social welfare while it must know, as our sociologists and criminologists know and dare not say, that those who have passed through its schools have the highest record in the civilized world of juvenile delinquency and crime. . . .

Already it begins to demand its price, as it did when it sold the blood-soaked liberties of the Italian people to Mussolini or those of the Spanish people to Franco. In Australia it recently persuaded the Labour Government of Victoria to try to extend to its critics the penalties of the law against obscenity; in America it has induced Washington to send Federal Police (G-men) to suppress criticisms of itself, and it is organizing its huge following to demand (as the price of its vote) that the nation (nine-tenths non-Catholic) should pay for that Catholic education that fills its jails from Sing Sing to Saint Quentin. But this account of its alliances with crime, its intrigues, its condonation of social injustice (Spain, Portugal, Brazil, etc.), and its international Hymn of Hate during the last twenty-five years shall speak for itself.

CHAPTER I

THE PRINCIPLES OF VATICAN POLICY

THE policy of the heads of the Roman Church is stamped in red letters on the history of Europe. Unfortunately no branch of public instruction—in school, Press, or literature—in our time is so lamentably distorted by suppressions and untruths as are references to the part that the Church has played in European history. The candour of the fine historians of the last century has disappeared with them. We now get histories of Europe which completely falsify the role of the Church, and our more important historians are silent. Trevelyan's *English Social History* conveys as misleading an impression as any Catholic could demand of the character and service of the Church, and Professor Toynbee's great work is marred not only by his disinclination to read critical literature, but also by his eccentric theory (which he strongly urges in his Bishop Burge Lecture) that the periodical collapse of civilization is part of the providential scheme of things because such collapse always promotes the growth of religion.

Does it matter if we leave the dead past to moulder on in its grave? It does, vitally, when the claims which are made for the value of the Church today are based mainly upon the apologist's version of history. It matters still more from our present point of view because, now that people know nothing about the Church's crimes against humanity in the past, they are less inclined than ever to consider critically its action in our modern world. In the last generation they knew—the greatest historical work in the English language, the Cambridge History, told them fairly candidly—of the horrors of the Middle Ages. But the massacres of the thirteenth and seventeenth centuries, the Inquisition, etc., were, the apologist told them, " forced upon the Church by the princes and peoples of the time " in their intense hatred of heresy—a monumental untruth—and are as obsolete as astrology or the witch-hunt. What ground, therefore, have folk for listening to a charge that the Vatican supported Hitler and Mussolini, or that behind the iron curtains which (if you will reflect) hide from our eyes the life of Spain and Portugal and the South American Republics today it protects a squalor and a religious tyranny little less than it did in the later Middle Ages?

Hence any examination of Papal activity during these thirty

years of monstrous and far-reaching events must begin with an inquiry into the law and principles on which Catholic policy is based today. How many of those who shudder at the prospect of a Third World War today have even the faintest suspicion that already in the last forty years the "civilized" nations have spent as much on war and the preparation for war as they have spent on all other needs and purposes of life put together? Yet the Church of Rome began to advocate a Third War within seven years of the Synod of Peace at Versailles, and has ever since been the chief source of the poison in the veins of the nations that threatens our civilization with at least an appalling catastrophe. And this action of the Papacy is based upon precisely the same principles of Canon Law as were the Massacre of the Albigensians and the Waldensians, the Inquisition, and the St. Bartholomew Massacre. This principle was, notoriously, the right, nay the duty, of the Church to put heretics to death, even if it left the actual execution to secular agencies: which it would punish with excommunication or interdict if they did not comply.

Is it possible that Rome holds that principle today? In the year 1917 the Vatican published, in Latin, the latest codification of its Canon (or Church) Law. British Catholics have not found it prudent to publish an English translation of this, for it is on scores of points in conflict with the civil law of every advanced nation, but this *Corpus Juris Canonici* certainly contains no reference whatever to the corporal punishment of heretics. The nice-minded folk, therefore, who airily represent my strictures as out-of-date, gladly accepted the assurance of apologists that the Church had formally abandoned, in principle, what it calls "the Right of the Sword." Even so careful and well-informed a critic as Professor Cadoux wrongly says, in his *Roman Catholicism and Freedom* (1936), of the new formulation of the law:—

> The only penalties prescribed in it were of a non-temporal character, and all penalties not explicitly prescribed (*and that includes the death-penalty*) were declared to be repealed.

The Code does not mention the death penalty, as the words I have italicized may suggest, but a reader who is familiar with the casuistry of such literature sees that it carefully avoids repealing the law.

Such a reader smiles at the reason given by Cardinal Gasparri in the Introduction for this new codification of the law. The real reason was that the Vatican had published an authoritative and official manual of Canon Law in 1901, and in this, as we shall presently see, it was emphatically and repeatedly laid down that

the Church has not only the right, but also the duty, to put heretics to death. The anti-clericals of France, Belgium, and Italy, who were then in a powerful position, made an effective argument of this, and the French bishops especially, who already saw their followers reduced to one-fifth, and the least-educated fifth, of the nation, begged the Vatican to declare this principle obsolete. Such a procedure would be impossible in an organization that never admits errors, and it was decided to compile a new Corpus or Code that might serve the purpose, yet not disturb the prelates of more solidly Catholic countries.

In his preface to the Code, Cardinal Gasparri explains that one of the rules given to its compilers was that it must include only "disciplinary laws." Experts distinguish between "public", Canon Law, which governs the action of the Church outside its own body, and "private" (domestic) or disciplinary law. The official Latin manual of 1901 had the title *Institutions of Public Ecclesiastical Law*, while the later Code is the private Canon Law. In the preliminary part of the Code (Canon 6, Clause 5) is the sentence to which Professor Cadoux and others refer :—

> As regards penalties which are not mentioned in the Code, whether they are spiritual or temporal, medicinal or (as is said) vindictive, actual or to be passed, these may be held to be abrogated.

But the very next clause corrects the superficial interpretation of this :—

> If any other of the disciplinary laws that have hitherto been in force are not contained in this Code, explicitly or implicitly, it must be said to have lost all force, *unless it is found in approved liturgical works or is a law derived from divine law, positive or natural.*

But the right to put heretics to death is decisively claimed on the strength of "divine law, positive [revealed] and natural." Professor Cadoux himself, in fact, quotes the expert Jesuit Cardinal Billot saying in the fourth edition of his *Tractatus de Ecclesia Christi* (1922) :—

> We must say that material force is rightly employed to protect religion . . . nay, that force can have no nobler use than these.

He quotes also the Jesuit Fr. Sortain saying in his *Traité de Philosophie* (for use in the training of priests) in 1924 that the Church still has the death-penalty against any who preach

heresy. He points out that Fr. Ronald Knox, the chief English apologist, claims in his *Belief of Catholics* (1927) that "you cannot bind over the Catholic Church . . . to waive all right of invoking the secular arm"; though he humanizes the matter by saying that where there is a Catholic majority it might be content to have heretics imprisoned or exiled.

It would be absurd to imagine that these apologists, especially Cardinal Billot, did not know that the Vatican had abrogated the right to inflict corporal punishment and death if it had done so. In fact the *Catholic Encyclopædia*, which was written at the very time the new Code was being compiled (1911), though concealing as far as possible the medieval features of the modern Church by saying nothing about this point in the article "Canon Law," claims very curtly, in the article "Apostates," that the law enacting the death-sentence is merely "in abeyance" (in reserve for the glorious day when Catholics will be the majority in Britain and America); and in its Supplement (1927) it does not say a word about any repeal of the law in 1917, as it assuredly would like to do.

The Church's actual teaching on this point is in the manual of *Public Ecclesiastical Law* (*Institutions Juris Ecclesiastici Publici*) by Fr. Marianus da Luca in 1901. This Jesuit was the professor of Canon Law in the Gregorian (Papal) University at Rome, and his book was issued by the Vatican Press and opens with a strong commendatory letter by Leo XIII, who clearly had not heard of any intention to modify the law. I have quoted the relevant passages in several works, but will here repeat them for the reader's convenience :—

> When the inviolable right of any society begins to be assailed and denied we have then above all to assert and vindicate it. Now, if this was ever done, it is especially in our age that we see the right of inflicting upon the guilty whatever penalties be necessary, however severe, particularly what is called "the right of the Sword" denied to the perfect society [the Church] and the death sentence buried among dead laws. . . . Against these legalists and their modern followers [Catholic Liberals or Modernists] we affirm that the Church has a coercive power even to the extent of the death sentence. We start with the vindication of this right for the Church, both on account of opponents who loudly accuse our Mother the Church of unjust and wicked action in sentencing heretics to death, especially of putting to death certain leaders of heresy and apostates, and because from the right to inflict capital punishment we easily deduce

the right to inflict lesser penalties [torture, prison, confiscation, etc.].—Vol. I, p. 142.

The death sentence is a necessary and efficacious means for the Church to attain its end when rebels against it and disturbers of the ecclesiastical unity, especially obstinate heretics and heresiarchs, cannot be restrained by any other penalty from continuing to disturb the ecclesiastical order and impelling others to all sorts of crime, particularly ecclesiastical crime. . . . When the perversity of one or several is calculated to bring about the ruin of many of its children it is bound effectively to remove them, and in such wise that if there be no other remedy for saving its people, it can and must put these wicked men to death.—Vol. II, p. 143.

Unbelievers who have at one time belonged to the faith, such as heretics and all apostates, may, absolutely and by common law, be visited with corporal punishment and even death, for deserting the faith, or may be compelled to return to it.—Vol. LI, p. 270.

This was official Canon Law in the early years of this century. Protests then, as I said, began to reach the new Pope, Pius X, the peasant-Pope, from embarrassed bishops, and he set afoot the preparations for a new codification of Canon Law. That he had not the least idea of changing it in this respect is clear from, not only his character, but the fact that in 1910, when the slow compilation of the Code was nearing its completion, he officially endorsed a new manual by Fr. (later Cardinal) Lépicier, another expert of the Roman University. This work (*De Stabilitate et Progressu Dogmatis*) has exactly the same statement : —

> No one doubts that they [apostates] do not merely deserve to be cut off from the Church by excommunication but that they deserve to be put to death . . . so as soon as any man publicly professes heresy and tries by word or example to pervert others . . . he may justly be put to death.

That is the law of the Roman Church.

It should be explained that in this kind of amiable literature " heretic " means apostate. The apologist is eager that you shall understand that his Church does not claim jurisdiction over Jews, Buddhists, Protestants, or Atheists if they have never received Catholic baptism. He is not eager that you should understand the complementary doctrine; that it *does* claim jurisdiction over all who were once baptized, no matter how much they protest that they have left it. The Church does not admit that any man

who was brought up in the faith can conscientiously cease to believe it, so that in its large figures of membership—3,000,000 in Britain, 30,000,000 in America, etc.—it counts millions of folk (myself, for instance) who in the common human judgment have left it. But in practice the Church has never confined its maternal chastisements (the rack, boiling oil, etc.) to these deserters. Very few of the Albigensians, of whom some hundreds of thousands were massacred in the thirteenth century, or of the Waldensians or the Huguenots, had received Catholic baptism, for their religion had flourished in their regions for several generations. Their mere existence as sectarians and enemies of the Papacy was considered a danger to the Church and, on the usual principles, they must be bloodily removed.

This entirely inhuman principle, denying freedom of conscience and crippling or executing those who differ from you, a principle which is therefore the very antithesis of our most treasured social principles today, is and has been since the fifth century the creed of the Church of Rome. One German historian, Sprenger, has calculated that, including the witches, who are now known to have held a definite anti-papal cult, it had nine or ten million victims from about 1100 to 1700. It was implied in St. Augustine's famous "*Compelle intrare*" ("Make them come in"), and formulated and carried out in its full brutality by Pope Leo I of the same fifth century. It was in the harshest form declared by Aquinas and the Schoolmen to be an obvious and inevitable inference from the doctrine of immortality and the Church's responsibility for the souls of men. It was accepted as a platitude of faith by all "the great Catholics" of history. It is now, as the *Catholic Encyclopædia* says, "in abeyance," not abrogated, for, while that American publication often ventures to misrepresent doctrine and facts in order to disarm critics and attract converts, it is aware that, on their own principles, the Popes may abrogate laws which rest only upon ecclesiastical authority, but cannot repeal laws that are based upon "divine law, either positive or natural," as Canon Law declares this principle to be.

But those numerous non-Catholics of our time who profess to regard it as an obsolete pastime and a proof of illiberality of mind to criticize the Church—I agree with Wells that they are in part responsible for the dangerous power of the Church today—are again superficial and incorrect. No one except a Catholic dreams that Catholics will ever again form a majority in any leading nation and set up stakes in the market-place for burning critics. Even if—a wild supposition—the Church did win the majority in the government of some one country, its action would be too critically watched by the rest of the world to permit the

viler of these outrages on freedom. It would, as in Spain and Portugal today, where it derives its power from dictatorship while it marches with us under the banner of democracy, have to rely on Catholic influence on the Press in other countries to conceal its virtual intolerance of other religions and its misrepresentation of critics as Anarchists or Communists in order to imprison or execute them. It would indignantly deny that it persecuted religion.

In stating the Catholic position, therefore, I am not in the least concerned about the question whether the Church would ever renew its *autos da fé*. It will never have the power. But on precisely the same grounds and principles it bases that pernicious policy which I trace in this book—a policy of alliance with dictators or with callous groups because they promise the clergy the power to scatter the poison of inter-racial hatred and the seeds of war against some nations which threaten the power of the Church. Many folk, Christian or not Christian, say that man's spiritual interests are in danger. The phrase is ambiguous, but to the Catholic mind it is crystal-clear: it means the fortunes of man beyond the grave, which outweigh his "material" interests as eternity outmeasures time, coupled with the belief that the Church of Rome, with its sacramental and sacerdotal system, is the only effective agency to ensure those interests. The Church must still use "the secular arm," but its means of persuasion are no longer interdicts or anathemas. They are a colossal wealth, the democratic vote, and a considerable economic power over the world Press.

There are two other characteristic principles of the Church of Rome to be considered. One is the maxim that the end justifies the means. No Catholic moral theologian ever stated that principle in those words, but it has been repeatedly formulated in other terms. In the Jesuit manual of moral theology from which I was taught the "science" of theology sixty-five years ago it is stated: "The morality of an act depends mainly on the end one has in view." Here, however, we are dealing with categories of acts which are for certain purposes regarded as legitimate, and we need not concern ourselves with the fact that in all ages clerics, especially Jesuits since the sixteenth century, have acted on the maxim that almost anything was justified in the interest of the Church. But the State and practically all its citizens regard execution and imprisonment as legitimate means of protecting society, and until a very recent date flogging (torture) was included among the means. Here comes in the argument used by theologians from the days of Aquinas onward. The Church is "the perfect society," and whatever is admitted as legitimate to

a merely secular society is clearly to be allowed, for its protection, to the immeasurably superior ecclesiastical society. The history of the Church shows that this was always interpreted in practice to mean that almost anything might be done in the interest of the Church.

Then there is the peculiarly Catholic casuistry of Mental Reservation. In earlier ages, with their cruder moral sense, this was stated by theologians as a right to make a false statement, provided you told yourself the truth in your own mind, when you considered that the man you addressed had no right to the truth. Could there possibly be a juster occasion to exercise this right than when the truth would be detrimental to the Church? Since Pascal's famous flagellation of the Jesuit theologians it has, like the maxim about end and means, been formulated less baldly. In Addis and Arnold's *Catholic Dictionary* we read :—

> Almost all theologians hold that it is sometimes lawful to use a mental reservation which (the truth you keep in your mind) may be, though very likely it will not be, understood from the circumstances.

CHAPTER II

ROME COURTS, THEN CURSES, RUSSIA

We shall get a clearer idea of the Papal policy if we take each leading country that was involved in the Second World War separately, but it is advisable to examine first a summary of the events of the last thirty years, which opened a new and very disturbing chapter in modern history. It is not necessary to discuss the attitude of the Vatican in the First World War, but the claim of Catholic writers that it was ideally neutral—though that attitude would have been strange enough on the part of a man who posed as the world's supreme moral oracle—is as blatant a misrepresentation as when they say that the Catholics alone opposed Hitler in Germany. We have not forgotten the stinging scorn with which Loisy, its finest scholar, addressed the Church when at last he abandoned it for its conduct in the war. Germany, it seems, promised the Vatican more than the very radical France of those days would grant it; and it was freely stated in the British Press that the Italians detected Papal agents secretly carrying messages to the Austrian enemy.

The Pope was therefore refused that share in the unfortunate Peace Conference at Versailles which he tried to get. If the Vatican had one-half the sagacity and integrity of moral judgment that are claimed for it, we should have heard from it a warning how the victorious statesmen sowed the dragon's teeth in the soil of Europe by creating a large Poland out of Russian and German territory, detaching a vital province of Austria for Italy, and so on. But these were Catholic countries, and in any case the Vatican was soon absorbed in a new problem.

Now that the Pope is one of our standard-bearers of Freedom and Democracy (except in those countries where he is still all-powerful), some of us look back with amusement, not only upon the 700 years' struggle of the Vatican against democracy, but also upon a very earnest book, *The Pope in Politics*, written by an orthodox English Catholic, W. Teeling, in 1927. It expressed the alarm of British and American Catholics at the anti-democratic attitude of Rome. It may be remembered how the first American cardinals sent a shudder through the large group of sleek Italian cardinals and other dependants of the Vatican by pressing for a critical examination of the secret finance of the Papal Court. Money now flowed into the treasury in a broad stream

from the West, but with it came a natural aspiration to share the power and control the wealth—estimated by French Catholic writers at that time as " several thousand million lire," or several hundred million sterling, a year—of the central bureaucracy of the Church. The Sacred College, therefore, decided that the growth of Catholic democracy in the West must be counterbalanced by conquests in the East or large-scale conversions of the 200,000,000 " docile " Slavs of the Orthodox Church. The idea that Vatican City is a shrine of statesmanship is an amusing myth.

The news that Tsardom had fallen in 1917 put new life into this Eastern Policy, for at the same time the power of the Orthodox Church was broken. Rome hated the Holy Synod, which had bitterly persecuted the Pope's subjects for a hundred years, as it now hates the Kremlin. Read the story in the *Catholic Encyclopædia*. Pius IX and Leo XIII used precisely the same picturesque language about Holy Russia as Pius XII does about unholy Russia; though they did not rouse the civilized world to see the iniquity of the Tsars and organize a Crusade against their country. It was therefore with edifying amiability that the Vatican approached the new Atheist rulers of Russia after the Bolshevik Revolution. The French Catholic writers London and Pichon tell us the story of that early flirtation in their book *Le Vatican et le Monde Moderne* (1933), of which Selden's *Vatican* is a translation and expansion. The Vatican, they say, at once approached Lenin, and was told that the propaganda of any religion was free in Russia, provided that it did not interfere in politics. As a matter of fact, the great Catholic annual procession of Corpus Christi passed unscathed along the streets of Russian cities, for the first time in Russian history, in 1918. But in the White War—Poland, especially, and Britain, France, Czecho-Slovakia, Japan, and America fighting with the White Russians—the Roman priests, when they saw a hope of the Poles taking over Russia, were detected in treasonable relations with the enemy. A few (see the Catholic Miss Almedingen's *Catholic Church in Russia*, 1923) were executed and the remainder expelled.

It is at this stage that we find the " martyrs " of the Orthodox and the Roman Church. The version of developments in 1917 and 1918 which Rome later manufactured recalls the wholesale forgery of martyr-stories in the early Middle Ages. The Bolshevik Revolution itself was, as Mrs. Litvinov (sister of the cartoonist Low) says in her history of it, " one of the most bloodless in history." The Socialists and the Liberals had dethroned the Tsar in the spring, but their mismanagement raised such discontent that the Bolsheviks won over the entire army and so

overwhelming a proportion of the urban workers that Kerensky and my friend Professor Milyukov, who were at the head of the Government, fled, and Stalin and his friends took over power without serious resistance and summoned Lenin. It was in the Invasion War of 1918–20 that one Roman and several Orthodox bishops were executed; and Miss Almedingen on the Catholic side, and the heads of the Orthodox Church (quoted in Sherwood's *Soviet War on Religion*, 1931), admitted that, as was natural, they had helped the invaders. But the clerical executions were very few, as even the Supplement to the *Catholic Encyclopædia* (1922) shows.

The story of massacres, first launched by the American Jesuit Father Walsh, grew so luxuriantly that a *News Chronicle* correspondent, Lancelot Lawton, who was in Russia at the time (but married a White Russian), says in his *History of the Revolution* that the Bolsheviks killed 1,275 archbishops and bishops. I fear that this is, since the author was a journalist and on the spot, the chief work consulted on the Revolution in our colleges and editorial offices. The holocausts are transposed from the time of the Invasion War, with its strong incentives to treason, to the actual Revolution in 1917. This accordingly becomes an ugly orgy of savagery, and so the violent language about it of the Pope and the Catholic Press throughout the world is considered just. Yet a mere glance at either the *Encyclopædia Britannica* or the *Catholic Encyclopædia* will inform any inquirer that at the time of the Revolution there were, including those in retirement, fewer than eighty archbishops and bishops in the whole of Russia. None was executed at the Revolution, and very few (for treason) in the Invasion War, which was conducted with ferocity, as such things are. We have, moreover, the assurance of the head of the International Red Cross Commission in this war, Dr. George Montandon (*Deux ans chez Koltchak et chez les Bolsheviques*, 1927, p. 16), that of all the troops the Reds were the most humane, in spite of appalling provocation.

I linger for a page on this point for obvious reasons. This terrible slander of the beginning of the Communist regime and the Soviet Union started in Catholic literature, and has been more fiercely repeated by the Catholic Press ever since than by any other; and it is the basis of the Pope's incessant assertions that "Atheistic Communism" means a return to savagery. But it still more painfully shows the levity with which the Roman slanders are accepted that no one ever notices that, after all this supposed slaughter of priests and prelates, the Pope again coquetted with the Bolshevik authorities.

There had been about 2,000,000 Roman Catholics in Russia

at the time of the Revolution, but they were for the most part Poles, and they had very naturally aided the Polish invaders, who had, while the White and international armies drew off such forces as Stalin and Trotsky could improvise to meet them, advanced nearest of all to Moscow. When the White Allies made peace in 1919, the Poles pressed on over the distracted country. The Red armies rallied and drove them out, and, as I said, expelled Rome's missionaries. The most pungent comment one can make on the Catholic slanders at this stage is to quote the undisputed historical fact that within a year the Pope's representative, the Archbishop of Genoa, had a most cordial interview with the Bolshevik statesman Chicherin, and asked and obtained permission for priests to re-enter Russia.

Three years of World War, two years of even worse Invasion War, the civil convulsions, and the onset of Lenin's fatal malady had left Russia in a state of unimaginable desolation. A deadly famine spread over the land, and many nations sent help. The other Powers were in fact anxious for trade reasons to restore the country, and Russia was invited to meet them at the Genoa Conference in 1922. Foreign correspondents reported to their papers everywhere that the Archbishop of Genoa paid particularly friendly attention to Chicherin, sitting next to him at the royal banquet. In short, the Vatican now got permission to send a body of helpers, headed by the American Jesuit, Father Walsh, to relieve the victims of the famine, on condition that they avoided propaganda. They, of course, did not, and they were expelled in 1924.

Four months later (December) Pope Pius XI gave the first of the long series of Papal warnings to the world. He called upon all " heads of governments " to unite to meet " the grave dangers and the inevitable injuries done by Socialism and Communism." Father Walsh himself published, on his return to America, a vile pamphlet, *Why Pope Pius Asked Prayers for Russia*, in which he gave the full story of the forged atrocities, and the Catholic Press in America has from that date to this demanded, and spent millions of dollars in the general Press in demanding, " the extinction of Bolshevism." The Knights of Columbus spent large sums buying space in the secular Press for two-column vitriolic articles, at the head of which I often saw an illustration, in red ink, of a Neanderthal-like Soviet soldier driving his bayonet into the body of a woman who lay on the ground. Every Catholic knew that it was not " prayers " for Russia that the Pope asked. London and Pichon, in the work I have already quoted, describe with candour the intrigue against the Bolshevik government.

But there was now a more serious reason for the East-to-West swing of the Vatican weathercock. While the Papal design to conquer the East had been the pathetic failure that might have been foreseen, the Soviet Communist plan to evangelize East and West had proved one of the most successful missionary enterprises in history; and this is the basis of the new Papal policy that helped to bring on the Second World War and is now trying to bring on the Third World War. It is the gentle Dr. Gilbert Murray who has proposed to call ours the Age of Lying. We have just seen a few specimens; though I fear that Dr. Murray absorbed these particular lies as uncritically as any. I am not a Communist or a member of any political organization, but ever since I quit the Church, fifty-four years ago, I have believed that a conscientious regard for facts is the only sound basis for any creed, personal or social; and it is facts that inspire and explain the deadly Papal policy.

The first fact, which will be shown in detail in the following chapters, is that in ten years (1920–30) the Vatican lost more followers than it had lost in the twenty or thirty years of the Reformation. I do not here glance at the Asiatic extension of Communism, since it had little direct concern with the Church of Rome. It is useful only to bear in mind that Rome saw with dismay that while it had gained miserably few Asiatic converts in the twenty years of its Asiatic policy, Communism had won at least 50,000,000 in ten years and had completely wrecked the Vatican policy. Our memories are so short in these feverish days and the Press is so selective in recalling events to us that it surprises folk to hear that as early as 1930 the Communists, about 100,000 in party-members but supported by 2,800,000 trade-unionists and 9,300,000 organized peasants, held the whole of Central China against Chiang Kai-Shek, who now used 1,000,000 men, tanks, thirty planes, and 300 guns. In China, Mongolia, Indo-China, and Burma they had won at least 50,000,000 adherents.

But it was the flow of the red stream westward that chiefly agitated the Vatican. Like the American Government, with which it has been in close contact through a personal representative of the President at the Vatican for the last twenty years, Rome tempers its hostility to Socialism for the time being so as to foster that feud of Socialists and Communists that has for forty years checked the growth of both parties. Yet the advance of each from 1918 to 1928 was unprecedented, not only in Italy, France, Germany, Belgium, and Spain, but also in the Latin-American republics, as will appear in a later chapter. In most of these countries the gains were almost entirely at the expense of the Papacy. In view of election and other figures which will be

given later, it is certain that in the ten years the Vatican lost something between 50,000,000 and 100,000,000 followers in Europe and Latin America. The Social Democrats had, it is true, struck the anti-religious clause out of their programme before that time, but there might at any time be a reconciliation, and the unofficial atheism of the Communists would leaven the mass.

However that may be, the Vatican faced appalling and increasing losses, and the aged Pope Pius XI, who was very far from the status of genius, and his Prime Minister or Secretary of State, Cardinal Gasparri, who was scarcely superior to him intellectually, were dazed and helpless. It was not until the present Pope, then Cardinal Pacelli, was recalled to Rome to assist Gasparri that the new policy became clear in the mind of the Vatican. It was to the interest of the governments of Europe and Latin America, and now very decidedly to the interest of the middle class, which for more than half a century had been the deadly enemy of the Church, to crush Communism and Socialism. It was also a vital interest of the Vatican, so the policy was indicated. The first opportunity for alliance was in Italy, where the throne itself began to totter. Here Mussolini had seen his opportunity and, disavowing all his principles—until 1924 he had been an aggressive atheist, Republican, and pacifist—he made his Fascist rabble, with its castor oil and cudgels, strong enough to win an alliance with the army and the throne and became dictator. But the Vatican, though pressed by the King, held aloof. Mussolini stank in its nostrils, and the core of his following was still bitterly anti-clerical. Negotiations began in 1927, but on account of mutual distrust and the high price that the Vatican demanded they dragged on (though Mussolini now obligingly discovered God) until 1929. In that year Pacelli was summoned to Rome.

He came of one of those " noble " families of Italy which had lost everything but its pride and its piety. Aristocratic to his finger-tips, he had in 1917, when it appeared that Germany could not win, been sent on a secret mission to the Kaiser to suggest terms of peace, with the Pope as mediator, that might save something from the wreck. He remained as Nuncio in Bavaria, and he saw the Socialists crush the Communists and the rabble of Nazis run with Hitler before a line of armed policemen.

In 1929 Gasparri, eighty years old and still wrangling with Mussolini, recalled Pacelli and surrendered to him the office of real ruler of the Church; and the angry quarrels that had followed the signing of the pact were smoothed. By Pacelli's first great success the initial step, the establishment of the first dictatorship, was taken by Europe along the path to hell. Mussolini sold one

half the liberties of the Italian people (freedom of conscience, of education, of marriage, etc.) to the Vatican; the Vatican, for an immense sum of money and a great extension of its power, sold the rest of its liberties to Mussolini. And the world-Press almost wept with joy in announcing that after sixty years of divorce the secular and the spiritual powers in Italy were reconciled.

Japan was encouraged. Its arrogant and callous commanders, defying their own timid authorities, grinning at the corrupt Chinese leaders, carried out the first part of the Black Dragon plan and seized Manchuria. You may remember the flutter in the dovecot at Geneva. The most powerful members of the League betrayed their oath and refused to impose even economic sanctions on Japan, but there was only one Power that, we shall see, actively co-operated with it. This was the Vatican City, under the man whom the Press calls the Pope of Peace. Pacelli at once entered into friendly and official relations with Japan, and those relations grew more and more cordial in the next ten years as the Japanese armies, leaving a trail of raped children and tortured peasants, rolled over China, while Chiang Kai-Shek—his " milk name " means " Steadfast Rock "—the literal blood-brother of a fanatic of the Japanese Black Dragon Society, turned his back on them and fought the Communists.

In the year after the seizure of Manchuria, which the Papacy virtually blessed in spite of the brutality and debauching of the Japs, the Spanish people carried out an entirely bloodless and democratic revolution, swept out their King and his corrupt dictator, and disestablished the Church. Vatican City now raved with indignation. The Spanish hierarchy was directed to attack and hamper in every way the highly respectable and progressive Socialist-Liberal Government, based upon the free votes of two-thirds of the educated folk of the towns, and when, in a few years, the Liberals had been alienated and the world at large prepared by the Catholic Press, the White Knight Franco set out, with the blessing of the Pope and Mussolini, to deliver the Spanish people. The world was flooded with new stories of the horrible outrages of these Communists (who were the smallest and one of the most decent political parties in Spain) who had somehow tyrannized over a solidly Catholic nation.

A year after the popular Spanish " revolution," which the Pope anathematized, Hitler made his first long stride to power, which also the Pope blessed. We shall see the most impartial, indeed partly Catholic, evidence that it was owing to the Vatican swinging Catholics to the support of Hitler, particularly in Bavaria, that he climbed to power. And Pacelli was familiar with the aggressive programme of the Nazis. The one language, in addition

to Italian and Latin, which he knows well is German; and he was the Vatican's spy in Bavaria when *Mein Kampf* appeared. The world took a long step nearer the pit; but Communism and Socialism were happily extinguished in Central Europe.

In the same year that the Vatican received its reward (a favourable Concordat) from Hitler, Cardinal Pacelli, looking for another world to conquer, decided to pay a visit—purely pastoral, of course—to South America. Communism had, under Russian influence, made such progress there between 1920 and 1930 that the most impartial and experienced British travellers conjectured, we shall see, that the whole half-continent would soon be Red. America, with its revised version of the Monroe doctrine, did not like this. Neither did the Vatican, for all these converts to Communism and Socialism were drawn from the Church. So Pacelli and a glittering suite crossed the ocean in 1934, and the middle-class descendants of Bolivar and Balmaceda, the hereditary enemies of the Church, reinforced by a large body of prosperous German Jews and Italians, kissed the ring of the representative of the " Venerable Church " and the " Holy See," as he travelled, beneficently, from Buenos Aires and Santiago to Chicago. Within a year or two the power of the Church was restored, the Reds were annihilated or in jail, and a military dictator of the Perón type, in close correspondence with Mussolini and (presently) Franco, was set up in six Latin republics. In Brazil alone there were 10,000 political prisoners in jail, and often under torture, by the end of 1935.

At the close of the same year (1934) Mussolini began to realize the aggressive programme which he had dangled from the balconies for years. He won a glorious victory over little and almost defenceless Abyssinia. The Papacy was silent, in view of the anger and disgust of Britain and America (for there was no Communism to crush in Abyssinia), except for one ambiguous expression, but the entire Italian hierarchy and Church vociferously applauded the enterprise. At one word from the Vatican they would have closed like a clam and greatly embarrassed the " conqueror."

In 1936 General Franco, after a visit to the Pope and to Mussolini, raised the rebel flag in Spain, where the Catholic Robles and his imported gunmen had caused great disorder while the Vatican and the Catholic Press of France, Britain, and America had prepared the world with bogus stories of Communist atrocities; stories which Pacelli put into the mouth of the Pope. But here there was no attempt at secrecy. The Spanish Catholic hierarchy greeted the military rebels as crusaders. The gold-and-white banner of the Papacy was the first to float over the rebel head-

quarters at Burgos, and Franco's pirate flag was abroad, first hoisted in Vatican City. Another nation that had won its freedom and democracy by a hundred years of heroic fighting and tens of thousands of martyrs was sold by the Papacy; and Spain slowly sank into the ghastly poverty and misery of today.

Flushed with the ease with which he had duped France, Britain, and America into a policy of Non-Intervention while his air-fleet showered death upon the poor Spanish forces, Hitler grew bolder. He would try the first part of his annexationist policy, Austria. That country was supposed to be in Mussolini's sphere, and the Austrian Government was pro-Italian. But the leader of the Austrian Church, Cardinal Innitzer, persuaded Pacelli that Socialism would be more easily crushed by union with Germany, and an Austrian Nazi, Seyss-Inquart, became Chancellor in the spring of 1938. He at once invited Hitler to come in and help to suppress disorder. Cardinal Innitzer betrayed his people and supported him, and Hitler and 50,000 of his best troops entered Vienna amidst decorated churches.

It has since transpired that the Allies could at that time have crushed Hitler, and possibly put an end to his evil dream, in a fortnight. They did not even make a gentlemanly protest, so Hitler turned to Czecho-Slovakia, the Gibraltar that guarded the route to the Ukraine, which for the last twelve years he had openly sworn to conquer. He organized the Catholics (of Austrian origin) of the Sudeten fringe and professed that as the Führer of all Germans he must redress their grievances. Russia now publicly stated that it was ready to join the Czechs, the French (who were bound by treaty to act), and the British to check Hitler. France, whose Catholic commander-in-chief, Pétain, a slave of the Church, had been (we shall see) a traitor at heart for years, refused. Mussolini formally lied to Britain, and we made one of the most ignoble surrenders in modern history, culpably allowing German generals to fix their frontiers. In the following spring the Catholic cleric, Mgr. Tiszo, President of Slovakia, very docile to the Vatican, completed the tragi-comedy by asking Hitler's protection, and the gates of hell were thrown wide open.

This coincided with the elevation of Cardinal Pacelli, after his fine ten years' work, to the dignity of Sovereign Pontiff; and in recognition of the great work of Pius IX, who had sold Italian Democracy in 1849—the centenary, you perceive—Pius X, who had crushed scholarship in his Church, and Pius XI, who had urged the workers of the world to adopt the Fascist model, he took the title Pius XII. He had hardly recovered from the fatigue of Coronation Day when Mussolini, helped by the Catholic

tribes (or bandits) of the mountains, seized Albania, the gateway to Greece. Hitler should not have *that*. The Pope complained only that it was bad taste to choose that date for the rape. The hammer of the armourer was now ringing all over Europe, and I will tell in each chapter how the Pope helped on the war he had materially contributed to bring upon the race.

His relations with Soviet Russia from this date may be summarily dismissed. There were none. The Soviet Union ignored Rome. The Vatican pelted the Soviet Union with mud from every country that had a Catholic Press and in Papal addresses and documents. For a time the poignant cry to the democracies (in which only a minority went to church) was that Russia persecuted religion. By an almost unprecedented interference in the affairs of another nation, a Member of Parliament asked about this in the House, and inquiries were dutifully made by the Government. The Foreign Secretary solemnly read in the House the report of our ambassador, Sir Esmond Overy :—

> There is no religious persecution in Russia in the strict sense of the term persecution, and no case has been discovered of a priest or anyone else being punished for practising religion.

Apart from the conscientious *Manchester Guardian*, I cannot find that any leading paper printed that. Such strictures as there were on the propaganda (not the practice) of religion were further relaxed in 1945. But the strident libels continued. These statements cannot be discussed here. It is enough that the Catholic Press, especially in America and Britain, encouraged by the Pope's words in his touching annual Christmas broadcast for peace, has used every last one of them to create in every country a poisonous hatred of Russia that may lead to a Third World War; while of the open preparation to use atom bombs, botulinus sprays, and poison gases the Pope says nothing. The Hymn of Hate was barely suspended when the heroic resistance of Russia broke the Germans for us. There were British Catholic papers which even then snarled that it would be better to die than to receive help from such a quarter !

CHAPTER III

THE SORDID DEAL IN ITALY

THE broad interpretation of what the historian optimistically calls Modern Times—from the Reformation onward—is that the period was one of revolt against privilege. First was the revolt against the tyranny of the Church of Rome, in which entire communities—kings, nobles, middle class, and workers—co-operated. About 1750 began the revolt against political privilege, and in this the middle class co-operated with, in fact led, the workers, few of whom had any education. But the middle-class men, not unnaturally, were of the opinion that uneducated workers and politically uneducated women ought not to vote, in the interests of the entire community and that they, as Liberals, would secure the interests of the workers and the women—and in the nineteenth century they had a fine record of this service.

But the economic revolt was as inevitable as the religious and the political, and it began with the appearance of Socialism or Communism; for Marx and Engels used these words as synonymous a century ago. As the Churches, particularly the Roman, had adhered to the kings and aristocracies in the political struggle, the middle class, which grew enormously after the Industrial Revolution, as a whole had become bitterly anti-clerical, especially when we made progress in science and scientific history. But as the third conflict deepened with the growth of Socialism they discovered that the cleric is a very innocuous person whose peculiar views and costumes need not be taken seriously. As a body they now formed an alliance with the Churches and the rulers to destroy Communism and then Socialism. The standard of the angelic hosts which had so long been led against Democracy now bore the device "Liberty and Democracy"; and to this the aristocracies, the wealthy, the Liberals, the Radicals, the clergy (provided they left their surplices at home), and even the Right-Wing Socialists could rally. That is the situation today.

Italy has passed through these three phases in little more than a century. In 1789, when the French Revolution exploded, it was still in the feudal-royalist-religious phase, as the Austrian Empire (which included North Italy) had blocked the progress southward of the Reformation. It was shaken by the invasion of

Voltairean ideas, then by the presence of French Republican and later Napoleonic armies, but the Holy Alliance after Waterloo had restored the rule of Austria in the North, of the Pope in the Centre, and of the King of Naples in the South. But the splendid struggle of the French and the Spanish against this restored feudalism reanimated the progressive spirit in Italy and, especially in the kingdoms of the Pope and the Neapolitan monarch, there was a half-century of struggle in which all the brutality of the Middle Ages was used by the Catholic kings and the Pope. I have estimated from such facts and figures as are available that in this struggle for democracy, from 1820 to 1870, about 400,000 unarmed men, women, and children, who did not even want to abolish kings and Churches, were done to death on scaffolds, in massacres, or in fetid dungeons and penal colonies, for their democratic aspirations; and of these 400,000 only a few thousand died in the Protestant countries, England and Germany.

That is another story, but two points ought to be remembered in connection with Papal policy and pretensions today. Against some even liberal writers of our time I might make the third point that these 400,000 deaths and the appalling volume of torture short of death occurred entirely after clerical-royalist recoveries of power, for there were never official reprisals or large-scale unofficial outrages when this power was taken from them by the people. It is painful to find even Rationalist writers of influence indolently repeating the statement, which is glaringly false in history, that popular revolutions—and I include the French and the Russian—let loose orgies of brutality while counter-revolutions were always gentlemanly. But such is the influence granted to the Roman Church over our literature (through reviews of books) and the Press in England and America today that only expert and specialist historians now know the full truth about even modern history.

The two truths which it is necessary to recall here are, first, that the Popes from 1820 to 1870 may have executed less than the Catholic monarchs, but they had just as vile a collection of jails and tortures. The second is that the temporal sovereignty which they protected by those brutal means was one of the lowest in the scale of civilization in Europe. Read the Catholic historian Lady Blennerhassett in our standard work, the *Cambridge Modern History* (Vol. XI); if it has not been withdrawn from circulation and replaced by a Catholic-revised edition before this book appears.

In 1856 Prussia, Russia, Austria, France, and England, in an open letter, admonished the Pope, in the interest of civilization, to reform his Kingdom, and the British ambassador, Lord

Clarendon, called it " the shame of Europe." Lady Blennerhassett quotes the famous French priest Lamennais saying, after a visit to Rome, that that city was " the most hideous sewer that was ever opened up to the eye of man," and Lord Acton in one of his letters to her (*Selections from the Correspondence*, 1917, I, 55) says that in defending this lamentable territory, or their income from it, the Popes " contrived murder and massacre on the largest and also on the most cruel and inhuman scale." I have never used such pungent language about the Popes as that of this great Catholic historian. Who in our age is permitted to suspect that this was the Papal idea of civilization less than a hundred years ago?

In 1870 the Papal States were incorporated in the Kingdom of Italy. The fact is now generally suppressed that the King and his ministry first ascertained by plebiscite the wishes of the inhabitants, and by an overwhelming majority they rejected the Papal rule. In Rome itself 40,785 voted against the Pope and forty-six for him. Catholic writers say that the plebiscite proved nothing because the Pope forbade Catholics to vote. But the above figure means four-fifths of the adult male citizens. Do these writers suggest that only one-fifth of the men of Rome were Catholics? Education and other reforms now began, and though there was a lot of corruption among the politicians, as there was in France, Spain, and America, the country rose to the rank of one of the five leading civilizations of Europe.

I have said that in the 1914–18 war the Papacy was in league with Germany, which seems to have promised to restore its temporal power, and that at the close an unscrupulous atheist lecturer and journalist, son of a country inn-keeper, Benito Mussolini, quarrelled with his Socialist colleagues and got together so large and robust a body of followers to fight the Socialists and Communists that the heads of the Army and the King adopted him as their champion. He cleared Parliament at the point of the knife and took the lead. But the Pope distrusted the sincerity of his " conversion ": in fact, knew that it was a pretence, and that he and the bulk of his followers were still atheists. Moreover, Mussolini's throne was not at all secure. In 1919 the as yet undivided Socialists polled 1,840,503 votes out of a total of about 3,500,000 (male suffrage). In 1921 the Socialists got 1,569,533 votes and the Communists 291,952, and they captured the municipal government in 2,163 towns. Our reference books continued to inform us, nevertheless, that Italy is a solidly Catholic country. They said in 1931 that about 41,000,000 out of the 42,500,000 were Catholics.

In this situation the " Vicar of Christ " and the atheist adventurer, a man of notorious morals all his life, vitally needed

each other. An entirely false impression of the situation is given in reference to their reconciliation. The figures I have given show that nearly two-thirds of the adult males of the country were Socialists or Communists, and these equally hated the Pope, the King, and Mussolini. The " old guard " of the Fascist Party, the solid core of Mussolini's followers, also were Freethinkers like himself, and were bitterly opposed to compromise with the Vatican. In addition, the middle-class Liberals, especially the university professors and their pupils, were generally Freethinkers, and they despised the Pope as well as the vulgar *parvenu*; though, as their Parliament was abolished and their bank accounts were threatened, these were ready to compromise. In other words, the manhood of the country was solidly anti-Catholic and anti-Fascist. Only three things could " save " it: the violent coercion of the Reds, the enfranchisement of women when parliamentary life was restored, and the complete control of education by a conservative agency; and this, clearly, had to be the Church.

The Press now reminds us with warm indignation every other day how Poland and the Balkan States had a totalitarian regime forced upon them. It never, if you reflect, tells us how this was done, and it certainly never reminds us how, only twenty years ago, the Vatican sold its support of the violent imposition of the totalitarian system on Italy; and without that support Mussolini's enterprise, which by 1929 was gravely threatened, might have collapsed. The March on Rome, in which several generals of the Army walked—I have seen them in photographs published in German works—was in 1922, after Mussolini had received a subsidy of 20,000,000 lire from the industrialists and an assurance of the Army's support and the King's neutrality. Professor Salvemini shows that the stories of Communist outrages, which so easily prepared other governments for the crime, were lies. But Mussolini found himself in an uneasy saddle, and in 1924 he had some of his Blackshirts murder Matteotti, the able and respected Socialist leader.

Was it this murder that held the Vatican aloof for four further years? On the contrary, there is good evidence that the Pope demanded an exorbitant price, yet that Mussolini increasingly needed him. In 1926–7 he abolished the democratic constitution and made himself official Dictator. The Vatican was heavily pressed to support this outrage on the democratic rights for which the Italians had paid so appalling a price, and it was offered about £19,000,000, in the shape of the sum, with interest, which the Italian Government had offered the Vatican in 1870. The Popes had for fifty years spurned it as blood-money. Now it really was

blood-money, and it was accepted. But the Pope demanded in addition that he should again have political independence and a small territory, the square mile of Rome that is now the Vatican City; that his religion should again be established by law and other religions scurvily "tolerated" (within limits and until better days); that the Canon Law should be enforced as far as possible (suppressing divorce, for instance) in the Civil Law; that the clergy should be generously paid by the State and a very large number of chaplaincies established, while hundreds of ex-priests must be expelled from the Civil Service (and virtually ostracized or driven back to the Church by hunger); that all schools and other educational institutions must be brought under the Church; that the communities of monks and nuns should have legal recognition as corporations; and that criticism of the Catholic religion should be made a penal offence.

Mussolini's older followers and lieutenants boiled, but in 1929 he paid, and the Pope received, the blood-price of Italian freedom and democracy; except that the universities stood firm and refused to pass under the Vatican yoke. In his attempts to soothe his angry followers Mussolini used such language about the Church that the Pope in turn burst into angry protest. In the form of a Public Letter of the Pope to his Secretary of State, a document not improbably written by the present Pope and published in the *Osservatore Romano* (the Papal daily) of June 6, the position of the Vatican was plainly stated; and it would have opened the eyes of Britons and Americans if their Press had given a translation (as they did not) of its main points. Mussolini had told his followers that he had secured that they still had freedom of speech and conscience in Italy; that he had in fact "made no concessions to the Church" and had "not surrendered the State control of the clergy and monks." The Pope, angrily remarking that Mussolini was "heretical and worse than heretical," said :—

> If it is meant that conscience is not subject to the power of the State; if we are asked to recognize, as we do, that in matters of conscience the Church, and the Church alone, has competent authority in virtue of the divine command, it follows that we recognize that in a Catholic State liberty of conscience and of discussion must be understood and carried out in accordance with Catholic teaching and law. It must also of logical necessity be recognized that the full and perfect right to educate does not belong to the State but to the Church, and that the State cannot impede or restrict it in the exercise and fulfilment of this right and must confine itself to financing the teaching of religious truths.

In a word, Italy had adopted the Canon Law. By the Statute and the Treaty which Mussolini had signed he had made the Catholic Church the sole religion of the State " with the logical and juridical consequences of such a situation according to constitutive law, especially in the matter of propaganda." The propaganda of any other religion or of irreligion was punishable by law, though the present circumstances of the world compelled the Pope to " permit " the practice of the Protestant religion.

With the friction that followed—for the Italian people at least refused to surrender the right of criticism, though in a few years there were 100,000 political prisoners in the jails and torture was not unknown—we are not concerned. Neither does the social inefficiency of the new regime require comment here. I will say only that, while Catholics in Britain and America got the myth of " Fascist efficiency " generally accepted, crime doubled (see the *Statesman's Year-Book*) in five or six years, and the internal debt from forced loans also doubled, with little to show for it except a " great army," which was despised even by the Germans in the war. It is enough that we have here a most important illustration of Papal policy. The Papacy did not merely sell, for gold and power, the Freedom and Democracy for which the Italians had shed so much blood, but sold them to a miserable adventurer whose programme of aggression and conquest was known even to little girls from their Fascist catechism; a man who was therefore heading straight for world-war. Even when, in 1934, Mussolini wrote a brutal glorification of war in the new *Enciclopedia Italiana*, saying (article " Fascism ") that " war alone raises the energy of man to the highest pitch and impresses a seal of nobility upon the nations which have the manliness to undertake it," scorning as a moral disease the peace of which the Pope chanted the beauty every Christmas and Easter, not a word of protest came from the Vatican. When Mussolini bellowed from his balcony that the Italians were above all " a race of conquerors " and that they were marching on " over the rotting corpse of Liberty," the Pope hugged his money-bags in silence. Can any honest man persuade himself that the Pope, or his Secretary of State, did not see the bloody road ahead?

If there had been any genuine doubt in the Vatican it was soon dispelled, for in the same year (1934) Mussolini set out to bludgeon Abyssinia. The Pope and his Grand Vizier were still silent. They dare not applaud because, as the Catholic Teeling says: " practically without exception the whole world condemned Mussolini, all except the Pope " (p. 129). Five years later Cardinal Hinsley declared that he privately heard the Pope con-

demn the war as "a barbarous outrage." Strange that when Catholics were wondering if their Pope was a moral coward the Cardinal should keep this valuable testimony a secret for years; if you can regard a whisper behind the walls of the Vatican as of any importance. The distinguished American journalist E. P. Bell was sent by *Liberty* to Rome to get a word of condemnation from the Pope. He confessed in his article in that weekly that the Vatican refused to give him one single word to quote. But ought we to say that the Pope was silent? From the Alps to Sicily the Italian Church and its clergy led the people in their rejoicing. Salvemini, who in his exile became a leading professor at Harvard, quotes forty-four of the bishops praising the war. That was the voice of the Pope, for he could at any time have forbidden it. And when Abyssinia was "conquered" he sent a printing-press and, at the expense of Mussolini, shiploads of priests, monks, and nuns to Abyssinia. He awarded the Golden Rose to the Queen of Italy. The Abyssinian Church had fallen under the Vatican.

In the fateful year 1939 Cardinal Pacelli was elected Pope Pius XII, as a reward, Cardinal Hinsley says, for his ten years' superb fight for peace! He had allied the Vatican with Germany, Italy, and Japan, helped Franco to seize Spain, and delivered the peoples of South America to the tender mercies of Fascist colonels and generals of the Perón type. His moral authority was mortgaged. On the very day of his coronation (March 12) Mussolini drove 69,000 Jews, beggared and suffering, from Italy, but the Pope was too busy to notice the outrage. His Church, it is said, saved many Jews; yes, rich "converted" Jews.

Within a few weeks Mussolini struck at Albania. It is wicked to suggest that the modern Napoleon just chose another little and weak nation for conquest. Albania, as folk were reminded in time, was the route from Italy to Greece. Mussolini had for years told Italy, with all the power of his lungs, that he was restoring the Roman Empire and going to conquer all countries round the Mediterranean: "Our Sea" he called it, in the old Roman language. And the Pope was just as eager to see the Greek Church at last under the yoke of the Vatican as the egregious Prince Ciano and his virago of a wife were to ride on white horses through the streets of Athens. Catholic hill-tribes, the Mirdites, in Albania were stirred to unrest, and they implored Mussolini to see that they received justice; just as the Austrian Catholics had invited Hitler to Vienna, the Sudeten Catholics had called him to Bohemia, and the Slovak Catholics had invited him to extend his beneficent sway over the whole of Czecho-Slovakia.

When the conquest was complete the only mild censure the

Pope had uttered was that it was very naughty of Mussolini to start a war on Good Friday, just when the new Pope was preparing his Easter message on peace. He became once more the Pope of Peace; which Hitler and Mussolini regarded as a graceful and harmless concession to his official position. He ended that terrible year, under the darkening heavens, with such a display of friendship for the rulers of Italy as Rome had not witnessed since the Middle Ages. With glittering ceremony and gorgeous compliments the King and Queen drove to the Vatican and the Pope visited the Quirinal. A brighter era was dawning. The world Press applauded. As yet only a dozen nations—China, Czecho-Slovakia, Spain, Portugal, Abyssinia, Albania, and the South American Republics—sweat blood and tears.

The Pope's complicity in the appalling war which was to follow will be put beyond question in the chapter on Germany. While he formulated vague peace-plans, of which statesmen took no notice, he exhaled noble sentiments without a word about the men who had already made a bloody ruin of so many lands. He was in close secret alliance with these men, who made no secret of their designs. We do not picture him to ourselves as a villain of melodrama, masking his evil intentions, for if you carefully study his appeals for years you perceive that he means peace on certain conditions, chief of which is that the world shall again submit to the kindly rule of religion. I should say that he was as sincerely duped by Hitler, Mussolini, and Matsuoka into believing that they would promote this aim at least by destroying Socialism and Communism and signing favourable Concordats with the Vatican, as the Western statesmen were. The parallel may seem odious, but surely there is some analogy between his position and that of Mr. Churchill as far as Italy is concerned. Until Mussolini actually stabbed France in the back Mr. Churchill was on very cordial terms with him. I quoted him saying in the *Evening Standard* how the staunch friendship of Mussolini insured us against war.

If we bear in mind the Papal policy and tradition and the fact that Pius had the mind of Innocent III, the man who had hundreds of thousands of the French (Albigensians) and Italians (Waldensians) drowned in their blood because they would not submit to him, who condoned the gross brutality of his Crusaders in Constantinople on the understanding that they would bring the Greek Church under the Vatican, we understand the Pope. His simple-minded, enthusiastic English biographer, Ransom, ingenuously tells us that a few weeks after his coronation Pius received so confidential a message from his Berlin nuncio, who was on very good terms with the Nazi Foreign Office, that he opened

the letter himself, brooded over it for two days, and told only his Secretary of State, Maglione, what was in it. Then there was "feverish activity" between the Vatican and the Papal representatives in Berlin, Warsaw, and Paris. The complete destruction of Czecho-Slovakia, which was sold to Hitler by the priest-president of Slovakia, Tiszo, and the invasion of Poland followed; and over neither of these did the Pope shed a tear, nor did they overcloud his New Year gaiety.

On the first anniversary of his coronation the Pope received by telegram the graceful compliments of Hitler, whose scheme for the conquest of the West was now fully mature. A few days later the Vatican radio announced, with obvious pleasure, that Ribbentrop, Hitler's second-best liar and most successful diplomat, was coming to see the Pope. This, said the speaker, portended "the beginning of a period of collaboration such as was desired by all, and not least by German Catholics and the ecclesiastical hierarchy." Shirer, one of the best writers on the period, says in his *Berlin Diary* that in diplomatic circles a new Concordat with Germany was expected. Ribbentrop was received with special honour at the Vatican on March 15. He talked with the Pope for sixty-five minutes, and then with Mussolini, who was due to meet Hitler at the Brenner Pass for their final agreement about the Western campaign in a few days. There were signs that Ribbentrop was disappointed. There were even rumours that Hitler had induced Mussolini to depose the Pope. All this is guesswork, but in April the Papal daily, the *Osservatore*, began—the only paper in Italy to do so—to publish the British and French war bulletins. See the independence of the Vatican, Catholics cried! They did not mention that this raised the Papal paper's circulation from 20,000 to 150,000, or note that in a few weeks this ceased and a new understanding with the Nazis was announced.

These facts are not disputed, and if I recall contemporary war developments the reader may guess what they meant. France and Britain had been at war with Germany (the "phoney war") since September. On May 9, a few weeks after Ribbentrop's visit to the Pope and the meeting of Hitler and Mussolini, the Nazis invaded Norway. Catholics begged the Pope to condemn this, but he replied that Norway, being Protestant, was not his concern, and he had to think of the 20,000,000 German Catholics who supported Hitler. Denmark had yielded to Hitler without a blow, so on May 10 the Nazis invaded Holland and Belgium, with particular brutality. Here were millions of Catholics, and the Pope expressed his regret, very politely, to the Queen of Holland and the King of Belgium that their kingdoms had been invaded

" against their will." Leopold of Belgium treacherously surrendered on May 28; four days after the *Manchester Guardian* had announced that the Vatican was again on good terms with Hitler and Mussolini.

How much of all this Ribbentrop had told in advance to the Pope no historian can say. Perhaps they spent the hour discussing the beautiful spring weather of Italy. It is enough that the Pope drew close to the Axis just when these conquests were complete and the attack on France was about to begin. But our *Annual Register*, which is decidedly not anti-Papal and draws only on the most reliable and impartial sources, says that it is known " from Vatican sources " that Ribbentrop told the Pope that " German soldiers would be in Paris by June and in London by August." When Mussolini struck at France the Catholics in their shame put out a report that the Pope had written to Mussolini imploring him not to attack. This was reported in the *New York Times*, and Professor La Piana, of Harvard, replied (*Nation*, March, 1941) that no such letter had ever been published and it seemed to be mythical. He pointed out that, as in the Abyssinian case, the Pope remained silent while the entire Italian Church danced with joy. From the Italian Press he quoted prelate after prelate blessing the magnificent victories of Mussolini—over a nation already beaten by the Germans and saturated with Catholic traitors. On June 16 the Archbishop of Gorizia in a pastoral letter urged his people to " lift reverent thoughts to the ever-victorious King and Emperor and to the undefeated Duce." The *Civiltá Cattolica*, almost an official organ of the Vatican, urged the soldiers to " shed their blood for the cause blessed by their religion." On June 27, when Catholic France lay in a mire of blood and shame, thirty Italian bishops sent a telegram to Mussolini asking him to " crown the unfailing victory of our army " by taking the Holy Land from the British and the French and putting it under Italy and the Vatican.

In 1942 there appeared in London an English translation of an anonymous French work *Pétain–Laval: The Conspiracy*. It gives ample evidence that Pétain had traitorously held and said for years that, for religious reasons, it was desirable that France should be " purified " by a great defeat. Weygand, the second highest in command, held the same view, and it soon transpired that the leading admiral, Darlan, and one of the most powerful politicians, Laval (decorated by the Pope, though a loathsome man), shared it. Are we to suppose that these leading Catholic laymen in the highest offices, corrupting France for years in the interest of the Vatican, never told the bishops and the archbishop, and that these never gave the good news to the Pope?

Upon the ruins of his country Pétain began, in collaboration with the foul brood of the Nazis, to exercise the power he had so long coveted and make France docile to the Vatican. The Papal *Osservatore* (July 8) was jubilant. " The aims of the dictatorship coincide with those of the Church," it said. The new device was not Liberty and Democracy, but Authority and Obedience. This was only ten years ago. The ensign of the modern age, red with the blood of hundreds of thousands of martyrs, was taken down over half of Europe and, as Britain faced the might of Germany alone, many expected that Europe was to be, with the Pope's blessing, solidly totalitarian. Today the same Pope is accepted as one of the standard-bearers of Liberty and Democracy, and he summons the American and British legions to pour poison and death upon the totalitarian East. All in ten years. What will the historian of the future make of us?

There is no need to tell how, through the throat of the Italian hierarchy, the Pope applauded every step in the campaign against the Greeks. The world looked very fair from the Vatican observatory, however little comfort those cowering folk of Britain, those tortured victims of a thousand camps, those half-starved men and women of a dozen conquered countries, found in it. But you can almost guess the rest of the story as regards Italy. The Pope's Yellow Brother in Buddha struck in his turn and roused the slumbering might of America, and in three years the Vicar of Christ was transformed from an ally of authoritarian savagery into the esteemed ally of Liberty and Democracy. The Catholic vote in those democracies which had escaped the totalitarian plans of the Pope and his friends, the Catholic threat to the revenues of any paper which printed anything " offensive to Catholics," wrought the miracle. The world, with its negroid music and dances, the inanities of its wireless, and its gambling on sports, has no memory today. It lives from day to day, as the Press directs it.

It was in 1943 that the Pope began to have a change of heart, but it was very far from being a sudden conversion. It reflected the turn of the massive tide of war. The Russians checked, then began to drive home, the German legions. The Americans checked the expansion of the Japanese and slowly turned it into a retreat. The Americans and British crept up Italy. By the end of 1943 even neutrals foresaw a defeat of the Axis. But a Catholic believes in miracles, so the Pope was discreet. When the Allies reached Rome he explained that his conduct so far had really been of service to America and Britain. By the middle of 1944 he was advising us about the peace, not merely the beauty of peace in general. The warm applause that the Soviet Union had won annoyed him. The peace, he said, must be on a Christian

basis, and Russia must be excluded from the drafting of it. The " proletariat "—the Vatican had just discovered this word or what it stood for—must be uplifted, but on the lines of the Papal encyclicals. In June, 1945, in an address to the cardinals, he sternly condemned the brutality of the Nazis, and when critics smiled the *Osservatore* explained that he had not earlier condemned atrocities because he was the common Father of victims and culprits. But surely, he said, the nations were not going to exchange this tyranny for another (Russian) or even " a three-Power dictatorship " (America, Britain, and France). The next thing to do was to put Germany under a Catholic monarch and, as the Catholic Fascist Prince Ruprecht of Bavaria visited him in Rome, his meaning was clear. Weizsacker, Hitler's representative at the Vatican, and an emissary from Pétain also visited the Vatican.

The new policy was rapidly emerging from the mist : a Catholic monarch for Germany, Austria, Czecho-Slovakia, Hungary, and perhaps Switzerland, and a southern Catholic bloc of France, Belgium, Spain, Portugal, and Italy, extending to South America. Fascism had merely to replace the fasces and the swastika with a crucifix and the triple crown. Pius had robust faith in the influence of his Church on the Government in America; and as far as Bavaria is concerned, he has got or is getting his way. In 1946 Italy voted by plebiscite whether it would restore the throne. The Vatican and the American Catholic officers did their best, but, to the Pope's anger, though the women now voted, there were 12,000,000 votes against the King and 10,000,000 for him.

In the summer there was a general election under the new Constitution. Now appeared another feature of the new policy. Italy, of course, was " overwhelmingly Catholic " (as Americans wrote home), but the Pope would not risk a political party with a Catholic label. The Vatican's party was the Christian Democrats, so that all the sceptics of Italy who detested both Socialism and the Church could rally under its flag. They won " a great victory." Of about 20,000,000 voters 7·8 million voted for them, and, as the largest party, they took power. But the divided Socialists and Communists had got 8·8 million votes, and there were still about 3,000,000 for smaller parties. These figures must not be regarded as Catholic or anti-Catholic, for the reasons I gave. Piety and prudence were mingled in what the world Press called " the Catholic Party," while the votes cast for the expressly anti-Catholic Socialists and Communists outnumbered them.

So the Christmas message at the end of 1946 was not so sweet. The fruits of peace, he said, were bitter. The Vatican did not intend to intervene—it had exerted all its strength in the plebis-

cite and the election—but it warned the nations that there was an anti-religious surge. Each of these vague allusions to the Soviet Union was taken up by the Catholic Press of the world, explicitly developed, and led the horrible growing chorus of hatred and demand for another war. But a large part of the world still regarded the Pope, with his record, like a converted burglar, and in 1947 he talked in a message about " the enormity of Germany's guilt " (Mussolini and Hitler were now dishonoured dust). But the Italian Reds weakened themselves by a split. The Left-Wing Socialists co-operated with the Communists, and these were excommunicated at the next International Trade Union Conference (led by the British semi-Socialists), so that at the next election the Christian Democrats, that fine blend of worshippers of God and worshippers of Mammon, won " a surprising victory." They got 48·7 per cent of the total vote and the Socialists and Communists only 30·7. The Socialists had, as I said, split into two parties, one working with the Communists, and the confusion alienated many who had supported them. A Catholic Minister said in the Camera that the Communists had lost 700,000 members in a year, but Togliatti produced the exact figure, 363,000. In any case, the election, notoriously, was dominated by the question of Marshall Aid; in other words, the issue was dictated by America. If the Christian Democrats won, there would be a big contribution from America; if the Communists won, the starving country might tighten its belt. There was even an attempt to murder the Communist leader.

The political aspect of these matters does not concern us. The figures, carefully analysed, furnish plain proof that far more than half the population of Italy are still opposed to the Church, in spite of American economic pressure in a time of great distress. In 1949 the Pope made the task of analysing the figures easier. He excommunicated all Communists—that is to say, any Catholic who joined the Party—and refused the sacraments (which is much the same thing) to Socialists and others who associated with them. To this time a large number of Catholic workers, stung by the customary leaning of the Catholic Government to the rich and the employers, had supported the Communists for their economic programme while rejecting their atheism. The Pope hoped to deal them a crushing blow, but it had the effect of killing all proposals of compromise with the Church on the side of the Reds.

As I write, the state of Italy is so bewildering that the London Press announces (*News Chronicle*, January 13, 1950) that for the first time in its sacred history the Papal organ, the *Osservatore*, admits to its columns a letter from Togliatti, the fiery Communist leader, blaming the Papacy for the crisis and calling for another

election. Only one thing is clear: the suffering of the people after five years of Catholic government and American support of it. In an official list published in December, 1949, the average consumption of calories per individual in Italy is the lowest in Europe. Unemployment is now widespread. Housing conditions are terrible. In the summer of 1949 Tom Driberg, the well-known journalist and M.P., visited Italy and described his experience in *Reynolds News*. He said :—

> Rome remains the most superb and sacred city in Europe. It is also at present the most immorally luxurious . . . nowhere else are there such extremes of opulence and penury. . . . The streets are full of sleek cars. The fixed-price meal advertised in the hotel-lifts costs, without wine, extras, service-charge, or tax, 1,000 lire (15s.) . . . On my first night in Rome an elderly, white-haired lady, of patrician appearance, stopped me imperiously in the street : " Excuse me, sir," she said, in fairly good English, " I am one refugee, You want my daughter, yes?"

The only other cities in Europe of which such a picture is given us by impartial visitors are also, apart from Ireland, the only other Catholic cities, Madrid and Lisbon.

CHAPTER IV

THE TRAGEDY OF SPAIN AND PORTUGAL

WHEN, in 1925, I wandered through the squalid streets of Toledo, a boy offered to show me, for a peseta, the places where his pious ancestors had hanged the wicked "Moors" in the Middle Ages. I knew well what a fine city Toledo had been, what a superb civilization Spain and Portugal had enjoyed under their Arab princes, and I would have liked to take the urchin by the hand and teach him a little historical truth. But friends of mine who had been in the jails of Spain, as political prisoners, had not described them and their torture-chambers as attractive, and those were the days of Dictator Rivera.

In my *Splendour of Moorish Spain* (1935) I have described the Peninsula as it was as early as the tenth century, when any one of a dozen of its cities could have comfortably bought up the whole of Catholic Europe. I told how it so withered under the restored Catholic kings that in little more than a hundred years the population, which had reached 30,000,000, fell to 6,000,000 or 7,000,000 of the poorest and most ignorant people in Europe. In my *Spain in Revolt* (1931) I describe the noble struggle which these fine Spanish folk made from 1815 to 1931 to recover their civilization from its inglorious kings and tyrannical Church and told how this struggle culminated, in the most honest election that the country had ever had, in the establishment of a republic whose work won the admiration of the free world.

Here we take up the story at the time when the present Pope, then Cardinal Secretary of State, began to apply his baleful policy to Spain. From the first the Spanish hierarchy bitterly opposed the new Liberal-Socialist Government that was put into power by a large majority—in the cities two-thirds of the voters. They rightly feared disestablishment and some loss of their lucrative privileges, but the "revolution" was bloodless. Large numbers of the clergy, it is true, fled with fabricated stories of outrages, but for two years the Cortes, with the placid support of the nation, continued to check the Church and pass a good deal of social-welfare legislation. Then a premature promise to break up the great estates—the absentee landlords of which owned sixty per cent of the southern and better half of the country—angered the Government's more radical supporters, and there was a revolt. The Communists certainly took the lead in this, to the anger of

the Socialists, although they were the smallest political body in Spain and normally by no means the most violent.

The cry of outrages was raised at once and echoed through the Catholic Press of the world. Lord Listowel and Miss Ellen Wilkinson, who told me their experiences, went to Spain to check these stories. They found them false and were assured by both President Zamora and Premier Lerroux—both very hostile to Communism—that they were false. Mrs. Leah Manning shows in her *What I saw in Spain* (1934) that two Spanish Cabinet Ministers also made a personal investigation and reported that the only outrages were really committed by Moroccan troops who had been brought over to crush the revolt and by the local Catholic police, often assisted by the priests and religious brothers.

But the unity of the progressives was broken. Lerroux, bribed by the Catholic leader Gil Robles, drew off his Liberals and sulked in his tent. Robles imported gunmen, and there was bloody fighting. The country went again to the polls, and the Government majority was greatly reduced. The two Catholic millionaires Juan March and Gil Robles spent vast sums of money, and the women, to whom the Socialists had given the vote in 1932, though as a body they had then been too bewildered to vote, were now driven to the polls in full strength by the priests. Invalid nuns were carried on stretchers to the polling-booth. The Socialist Government still had the majority of seats in the Cortes and resumed power, and the plea, in justification of the Franco rebellion, of the Catholic Press, repeated very emphatically in this country by a leading statesman, that if you counted the total vote the clerical royalists had the majority was false. The clerics polled 4,750,000, the Socialists 4,356,000. But the Liberals, all anti-clericals and republicans, had 340,000 votes, and the 3,000,000 who did not vote were mainly Anarchists and Syndicalists, both very powerful bodies in Spain, who were opposed, on principle, to central government as well as to the Church, and would not vote.

Such were the developments which preceded Franco's revolt in 1936. I told the story at some length in my *Papacy in Politics* in 1937, but there is no serious dispute today about the Pope's complicity in the revolt. Franco visited Rome just before he mutinied, and the first (and for a very long time only) foreign flag that flew over his headquarters at Burgos was that of the Papacy. Much more important and less known is the Pope's share in what Brailsford called the "obscene farce" of non-intervention on the part of Britain, America, and France, while Italy and Germany won the war for Franco. A number of Spanish bishops, priests, and nuns fled to Rome, and on Sep-

tember 14, 1936, Pope Pius XI delivered to them an address the robust accents of which clearly indicate Pacelli instead of the senile Pope. The Catholic Truth Society published an English translation of the address, and it travelled over the civilized world and did much to protect the shameful conduct of Britain and America from criticism. It is typical of Papal policy and I quote it at some length :—

> All that is most fundamentally human, all that is most profoundly divine, consecrated persons and sacred things and holy institutions, inestimable and irreplaceable treasures of faith and Christian piety as well as of culture and art, the most precious antiquities, the holiest of relics, dignity, sanctity, the fruitful activity of lives wholly dedicated to religion, to science, and to charity, the highest members of the sacred hierarchy, bishops and priests, consecrated virgins, the laity of every class and condition, venerable gray hairs and the first flower of youth, the sacred and solemn silence of the tomb itself—all has been assaulted, violated, destroyed and in the most ruthless and barbarous of ways, in an unbridled and unparalleled confusion of forces so savage, so cruel as to have been thought utterly incompatible, I do not say with human dignity, but with human nature itself, even the most miserable and debased. . . .
>
> One would say that a satanic preparation had rekindled, in our neighbour Spain, that flame of hatred and savage persecution which has been professedly reserved for the Catholic Church and the Catholic religion, as the one real obstacle in the way of those forces which have already given proof and estimate of their quality in the attempt to subvert established order of every kind from Russia to China, from Mexico to South America. These attempts and preparations have been preceded and unfailingly accompanied by a universal, persistent, and most astute propaganda, intent on subjecting the whole world to those absurd and disastrous ideologies which, once they have seduced and stirred up the masses, aim at nothing less than arming them and throwing them madly against every institution, human and divine.

I do not think that I have ever seen elsewhere so much falsehood, so much monstrous misrepresentation of the service of the Spanish clergy and of the aims of the Communists, such fatuous falsification of the position of the Roman Church in the world, crammed into thirty-one lines. But here I can notice only the monumental and evidently deliberately written lies about

outrages in the Spanish Civil War. All civil wars, especially if they have a religious element—" the more sacred our ideals are the more savagely we fight for them," said Chesterton—are very apt to degenerate into savagery, but, as in the Russian Civil War, of which I wrote in the second chapter, impartial witnesses attributed the worst conduct in the Spanish struggle to the troops on the clerical side. " Carlos Prieto " (a pseudonym, I understand, of an official of our Foreign Office) makes this clear in his *Spanish Front* (1936). The Pope, you will note, made his elaborate speech—certainly not extempore—within two months of the opening of the revolt; and he is clearly very angry that Franco's plot to carry Madrid at once and make it a short war had been foiled. However that may be, Prieto shows that the war correspondents in Spain reported complete savagery, of the later Nazi type, on the part of the Moroccan troops that Franco had brought over to win his cause. For the few weeks before the Pope spoke he quotes grave evidence of " mass massacres " from *The Times* (August 17), which would certainly not be accused of favouring Socialism. The Italians (who were at once in the fight, for the plot had been concocted in Rome with the Pope and Mussolini), the Portuguese, who gave full assistance to Franco, and the rebels used churches, even cathedrals and religious houses, as barracks; very naturally, as the whole Spanish Church welcomed and helped them. Yet we read of few outrages by the Government troops. We even read of Communists piously storing works of religious art to prevent their destruction !

In the circumstances the Pope's (or Pacelli's) carefully written message to the world, as it really was, must be regarded as the most important document given to the world to that time reflecting Rome's policy of stirring, largely by calumnious untruth, the leading nations, chiefly America, Britain, and France, to destroy Socialism and Communism, if not to dispose them to listen to the pretensions of Hitler and Mussolini that they were aiming at that purpose. He drags in the current and grossly inaccurate version of the Russian Revolution, events in Mexico (with which I will deal, from personal observation, in a later chapter), South America (where, he knew, the Reds were, as a result of his personal intervention, powerless and brutally treated), and China, where the Communists were isolated and peaceful. It was a very typical piece of Vatican propaganda, and had no slight influence in fooling France, Britain, and America while the Nazis and Fascists gathered strength.

The Germans, Italians, and Portuguese eventually won the struggle for Franco. It says much for the character of the Spaniards and their solidarity with the Socialist Government that

they resisted this formidable force so long, although the devoted Foreign Legion was small and Russia, as one hardly needed to glance at the map of Europe to realize, could give little help. For the seventh time the people, who had made an heroic struggle since 1815, sank back into subjection to the Church and aristocracy, while the Press of the world faintly applauded and the Catholics of the world burst into jubilation. The Pope broadcast this message on April 16, 1939 (quoted by his Catholic biographer Rankin, p. 145) :—

> The nation chosen by God as the principal instrument for the evangelization of the New World and as the impregnable bulwark of the Catholic faith has given the loftiest proof to the champions of the materialistic atheism of our age that above everything stand the eternal values of religion and the spirit.

That sort of thing gives one a peculiar sensation in the œsophagus. At the best it reminds us of the boast, which Catholics have forced into modern literature, that the grand Spanish warriors of the Middle Ages, of whom the Cid (a cruel and unscrupulous beast) was typical, set out from their fringe of territory in the north and overthrew the mighty civilization of the Arabs. In fact, they had with them the scum of the knighthood of Europe in search of loot, and the Arabs had been fatally weakened by Moorish fanatics from Africa. As a description of the new Spain and what had really happened in it the Pope's assurance was as monstrous as his message in 1936.

The great nations were for a time uneasily content. They had " confined the conflagration " to Spain. They soon saw, however, that what had really happened was that for Germany and Italy the tragedy of Spain was just a curtain-raiser to a greater tragedy : a little practice for their troops and planes. When Franco, to whom the Nazis promised Gibraltar, the whole of Morocco, and part of Algeria, secretly engaged to join the Axis, and did send 9,000 of his troops to fight for it in Russia, Britain began to perceive that this destruction of Socialism and Communism in Spain had been a pretext to cover greed and villainy, as it so often is. Our Press began to publish articles by impartial observers who got through the real iron curtain that Franco put up. On September 24, 1941, the *News Chronicle*, which is extremely sensitive to Catholic opinion, published an article by a patriotic French girl who escaped to Spain. She called it " passing from the Vichy purgatory to the Spanish hell ". Our very impartial *Annual Register* said in 1947 :—

While there are many signs of opulence, the bulk of the population of all classes were able to keep body and soul together only by black market connections.

Black-market prices even for bread were appalling. It was bad, and was severely rationed for holders of third-category cards (who were ninety per cent of the people). All hated "the corrupt totalitarian tyranny." The jails were crowded, the firing squad busy from 1939 onward. Other writers told us that graft was universal among Franco's loyal supporters. A duke or a general, a spy or a parasite, would have a lien on the tramway-service, milk-service, and so on, while the country was, and is, really bankrupt, and the choicer streets of Madrid blazed with gaiety at night. Noel Baker confirms all this in his *Spanish Scandals* (1948).

The Pope's enthusiasm for his shining crusader waned. The Phalangists gave ground to the Traditionalists (Franco's party) and these to Catholic Action, which is mainly royalist. The Pope was not even conciliated when Franco, with superb egoism, decreed that Spain would have a monarchy after his death. Don Jaime is to be the real builder of a glorious Catholic civilization. Does it matter to the Vatican that every single member of this Bourbon dynasty since 1814, except Alfonso XII, who was as dissipated as any but died young, has been expelled by the Spanish people, though always supported by the Church, for corruption of one kind or other?

The story of Portugal runs parallel with that of its big Iberian sister. The Romans gave it fair culture; the Arabs gave it very high prosperity and art; the Church dragged it into the gutter. In 1947 all Lisbon blazed with a celebration of the 800th anniversary of its liberation from the "Moors." It ought to have mourned. Few people realize today that the glamour of the Spanish and Portuguese empires of the sixteenth century was due to the fact that they took over the very rich civilization of the Arabs and added thereto all the wealth they discovered in America; and few of those who know this ask why, in little over a century, they were beggared and despised. Some talk about the economic blunder of the Mercantile Policy, but England and France also followed this. As Lord Macaulay said, "The decay of the southern countries is to be mainly ascribed to the great Catholic revival." Pombal, the Voltairean, made noble efforts to raise it once more in the eighteenth century, but the Church ruined him. In the first half of the nineteenth century there was the usual bloody struggle of the middle class for "democracy and freedom," and tens of thousands of them perished with every circumstance of barbarity. In the latter part of the last century

and the first decade of this, unscrupulous politicians, selfish thugs, and ambitious soldiers exploited the incredibly ignorant and impoverished peoples, fifty-three per cent of whom (over the age of seven) were still illiterate in 1940.

In 1910 men of the finer middle-class type like Professor Braga carried out a democratic revolution—my Spanish friends gave me the names of the chief conspirators three years before—but the military leaders, supported by the Church, continually rebelled, and in 1926—this was Portugal's eighteenth revolution in sixteen years—they swept away the democrats and anti-clericals. Almost from that time General Carmona (as sleeping partner) and Dr. Salazar as Prime Minister and real Dictator have ruled Portugal; and heaven only knows how many thousands they have added to the prodigious roll-call of martyred democrats since 1815. So foul is the rule of the virtuous Salazar, a lay Torquemada, that plots still occur. In 1947 the aristocratic Admiral Cabacedas was arrested and punished for leading a revolt, but with Salazar spending £1,000,000 a year—three times what Britain does—on secret service and evil tortures in his jails, he is even more firmly established than his friend Franco, whose triumph in the Civil War greatly assisted him.

Portugal is, like Spain, excluded from the United Nations. When you reflect that Greece, Persia, and some of the South American republics are admitted, this means a good deal. In the British Press, however, with its powerful Catholic influence, Portugal is our noble ally, and few have any idea of its real condition. A few pages earlier I quoted a work of "Carlos Prieto" (*Spanish Front*). He lists from an article in *Time and Tide* (September 12, 1936) by H. G. Dabby, who has had a personal experience of Portuguese jails, these instruments of torture that are used in them: thumbscrews, burning the soles of the feet, squeezing the head in book-presses, hanging by wrists and ankles, nude imprisonment in temperature below zero, walking in a circle until the prisoner drops, electric chairs. Viler tortures were used, as friends of mine saw, in Spanish jails early in this century: tight cords on the genitals, for instance. See my *Martyrdom of Ferrer* (1909). And while their champions writhe in these jails, there is a steeper contrast of wealth and poverty than in Spain. Some years ago a lady who lived, and had lived for years, in a provincial town, sent me a series of long letters describing the life, from that of the sleek, openly-immoral bishop to the incredible degradation of the poorest. The series came to an abrupt end, and I trust the good lady is still alive. Terrible? Remember that in Canon Law the Church has the right and the duty to punish rebels against itself with death or any punishment short of death.

CHAPTER V

THE DEAL WITH THE DEVIL IN GERMANY

If there is one country in the world that Pope Pius XII knows almost as well as his native Italy it is Germany. For eight years (1917–25) he was Papal Nuncio (ambassador) at Munich, and then for four years (1925–29) at Berlin. Other statesmen might plead that they never quite understood this monstrous aberration in the life of Germany until it revealed its malignancy in the war. The Pope cannot. He saw the birth of Hitlerism in Munich, and knew how the Bavarian Catholic authorities, with whom he was familiar, at first encouraged it. He was transferred to Berlin about the same time that Nazism was transferred to it, and he saw the wealthy industrialists convert it into a power that must be taken into account in Church politics. He had no more respect for the apostates, Goebbels and Von Papen, than he had for the drug-sodden Goering, who lived parasitically with Hitler on a few rich supporters, chiefly the big Catholic industrialist Thyssen, in Munich. He may or may not have read *Mein Kampf* when it came out under his eyes at Munich, but it was a vital part of his business to study its gospel and inform the Vatican when the capitalists of Western Germany adopted it and scattered it over the country by the hundred thousand.

Probably he understood better than any statesman in France, Britain, or America what the new movement meant. Those of us who are old enough remember how in 1914 the journalistic and literary fashion was to express astonishment that "a nation of poets and philosophers"—it had not had a great poet since Goethe—became so bellicose and aggressive. After the Second World War the fashion was to say that the character of the German people is incurably military and aggressive, and we must now spend vast sums seeing that it is not allowed, as it was after the First World War, to assert itself again. Pacelli knew well that there was no such development after the First World War. When, in 1923, Hitler summoned all the "secret" military societies in Germany for the grand march on Berlin, he got, including his Nazis, only about 2,000 followers, and they fled, Hitler leading the race, at the first volley from the police; and the movement almost died in the next three years.

Pacelli must have understood what really happened. Hitler, an Austrian, neither expressed the "German spirit" nor was he,

as Mr. Churchill said, " a genius born of the miseries of Germany." The nation laughed at him until 1929, and, for that matter, the majority continued to laugh at him until laughing meant the concentration camp or at least a brutal beating from S.S. men. In the last free election that they had (1932) he got less than a third of the total votes. But Pacelli saw the rich newspaper-owner Hugenberg (the Silver Fox) take him up at the end of 1929, and the chief bankers and industrialists in 1930 and 1931. One can hardly say that this was birth from " misery." I was in Germany in 1919, lecturing for the War Office, when the terms of peace were announced, and I saw the nation stunned and furious at their enormity. I crossed the country in 1925, and found it still ragged and hungry. But that was the turning year. In the next four years the agents of American bankers practically forced loans amounting to £400,000,000 upon the Germans, and with this and a sober Socialist Government they rose to their feet. In 1929, when Pacelli left, the country was prosperous; but Russia also had recovered, and Socialism was very powerful. So Thyssen (Catholic) and Hugenberg (Protestant) induced the bankers and the great industrialists to see that something might be made of this dream of enlarging Germany and annexing a large part of Russia. They, Thyssen says, poured hundreds of millions of marks into Hitler's treasury and boomed him in their chief dailies. Even large British and French subsidies came in. The thug-army swelled to 600,000 men. The vote rose higher and higher. For the elections in November 1932 a supreme effort was made. This was the last entirely free election in Germany, and in spite of the ten years of Nazi propaganda, S.S. brutality, and a bursting treasury this was the result :—

Total vote	35,148,470
Nazi vote	11,737,391
Socialist-Communist . . .	13,232,292
Catholic (and Jewish) . . .	5,326,583

Nazi writers admitted that they were profoundly dejected. They had won less than one-third of the German people.

It was at this critical moment for Germany and for Europe that the Vatican threw its weight into the Nazi scale. Thyssen, who came to quarrel with both the Nazis and the Church, said later in the Swiss Press : " Pacelli put Hitler in power." He certainly threw the last ounce of weight on to the scale. Hitler sent one of his chief lieutenants, Franz von Papen, to see the Pope. Papen was not only a Catholic—you may have wondered by what miracle he escaped hanging with Goering and the other leaders—but a Papal Chamberlain, and in high favour with the new

Secretary of State. The Catholic prelate, Mgr. Klaas, was sent to Berlin by the Church, and he described Hitler to the Vatican as "the bearer of high ideals who will do all that is necessary to save the nation from catastrophe." What Hitler promised the Papacy will appear presently. An unholy bargain was struck. Orders were, as a French Catholic writer tells us in the (Catholic) *Revue des Deux Mondes* (January 15, 1935), sent to the German bishops to drop their hostility to Hitler, and even our strictly impartial *Annual Register* says that Hitler's success at the subsequent election was due to "the gigantic swing-over of the Catholic middle-class vote" in South and West Germany.

Even with this Hitler was not at all sure that he could win power, so Goering's men burned the Reichstag and roared out the now familiar cry of "Communists"; and the parliamentary prospects of the Communists were doomed. The Socialists also were forbidden to hold meetings. Von Papen, who boasts of this in a published lecture to a Catholic audience (*Der November 12, 1933*), induced the senile President Hindenburg to make Hitler Chancellor and, forbidding any party but the Nazis and the Catholics to work in the electoral campaign, he went to the poll. The result even of this was :—

Total vote	39,316,873
Nazi vote	17,265,823
Socialist-Communist vote . .	12,021,884
Catholic (and Jewish) . . .	5,496,054

With all this pressure and support the Nazi Party did not get half the votes, but with his new Catholic allies it had the largest party in the Reichstag, and took power.

You will not fail to note from the figures in both elections that the Catholics—I put together the figures of the two explicitly Catholic bodies, the Centre Party and the Bavarian People's Party—who in all our reference books counted as one-third of the nation, were only one-seventh. Indeed they were less because, as the Catholic Emil Ritter says in *Der Weg des Politischen Katholicismus* (1934), the Jews voted with them. Their hierarchy had sought relief from Socialist pressure by alliance with a bunch of unscrupulous adventurers, largely apostates, leading a body of followers who were, to a very grave extent, and notoriously, brutes and sodomists.

Thus it does not matter whether or no we say that Pacelli "put Hitler in power." Hitler seems to have thought so, for he signed the Concordat that the Vatican drafted and strained himself to talk piously. The British Catholic *Universe* respectfully reported (March 31, 1933) him saying :—

> Just as we see in Christianity the unshaken foundation of the moral life, so it is our duty to continue to cultivate friendly relations with the Holy See and to develop them.

How Roehm and Horst Wessel and other of his trusted lieutenants must have sniggered! But whether or no this alliance was as valuable to Hitler as Thyssen represents, it was one more illustration of the profoundly immoral policy of the Vatican. As in the days of Gregory VII and Innocent III—the two most religious of the Popes—the end justified the means.

Ten years later the *Universe* and all the other Catholic papers were boldly telling their readers that the Catholics were the only body of the German people to oppose Hitler and defy his S.S. brutes! It had not taken these licensed thugs long to find that they might now use knives as well as whips. Almost immediately there was an organized onslaught on the Jews of Berlin. The Pope was silent; and it is false that Cardinal Faulhaber condemned the outrage. The Concordat was in the balance. But there is a more important historical fact. The new Reichstag assembled in April, and Hitler at once demanded that the members should surrender their power to him and recognize him as Dictator. The Catholic deputies metaphorically kissed his feet. The ninety-four Socialists opposed his demand; and they all went to concentration camps, where most of them are buried, to join the Communists who were already there. And the Catholics of Berlin joined the Nazis in the mighty rejoicing that followed on April 20, Hitler's birthday. So the Vatican got its Concordat and rejoiced. And in the name of the German Catholic Church Cardinal Bertram, who was its head, assured Hitler of their "sincere readiness to co-operate to the best of their ability with the new Government" (*Universe*, August 18, 1933). The honeymoon of Cross and Swastika was on.

But there does not seem to be an Italian equivalent of our saying that "he who sups with the devil must use a long spoon." Within a year we find Cardinal Pacelli warning German Catholics against "false prophets who, in satanic pride, pretend to be the bearers of a new creed." Well, you will ask, how's that for Catholic courage? Unfortunately, I must add that Pacelli was 5,000 miles away, in South America, and that he used this language only in a private letter to Cardinal Schultz, who omitted to publish it. Hitler soon ignored his agreement. He did, for the same tactical reason as Napoleon, want the people ruled by the Christian religion, but it must be a joint Catholic-Protestant National Creed, dropping both words. He would have no

State within a State. He fell upon the Catholic schools, Catholic fraternities for boys, and so on. Catholic leaders like Strasser and General von Schleicher were included in his Blood Purge or Massacre of the Sodomists in the summer of 1935.

Faulhaber and the bishops now murmured. In an article in de Valera's organ the *Irish Independent* (August 13, 1938) we read:—

> Cardinal Faulhaber was very friendly to National Socialism at the beginning, and was thought so much of by the Nazis that the fact that he found it impossible later not to oppose certain elements in their policy hurt as well as annoyed them.

How polite; considering that Hitler had now set out to destroy the Roman Church as such! But while many ministers, of both sects, went to jail or concentration camps, the bishops did nothing. In January 1935 the population of the Saar province, which is overwhelmingly Catholic, had to decide whether they chose to remain under Catholic France or join Germany. There were 477,119 votes for Hitler and only 48,637 (largely Jewish) against; and every church was decorated. Hitler was encouraged. The League of Nations had given no such option to the overwhelmingly Catholic folk of Rhineland. It was to remain demilitarized. In March 1936 Hitler defied France and sent his armies in with bands blaring and banners flying to occupy it; and the church bells everywhere rang out a welcome.

A few months later Hitler dealt the Church a blow that would have led the British, French, and Americans to regard it with amazement if their Press had published the facts, but the Catholic influence on the Press of those countries proved strong enough to prevent them publishing the most sensational news of the century, though the scandal spread over two years and half of Germany. I remember that one or two London papers published a short notice of the first day of a long series of trials. The closure was imposed by our Catholics at once and, while all Germany was for a year discussing the trials, the Press even in Catholic provinces expressing its abhorrence of the scandal, nothing more was published in this country. I must give a few lines about the nature of this extraordinary scandal.

In the American *World Almanac* for 1939, a leading annual and very sympathetic to the Roman Church, we read (page 236) that "up to October 1936 more than 8,000 Catholic monks and lay brothers had been arrested by Nazi officials, approximately 50 per cent of the 16,000 members of German monasteries, on various charges." To put it correctly: "8,000 priests (some of high rank)

were 'arrested', and forty-five monks, 176 lay brothers, and twenty-one monastery employees were sentenced on immorality charges, and 188 priests were acquitted or released without trial." The second sentence refers only to the first batch of trials, and the first refers to the whole two years. The two chief charges were smuggling money out of the country after legal prohibition, and sodomy, and the latter was the charge in the great majority of cases. The flowing robes and " sacred persons " of monks and nuns were considered very convenient for illegal export (chiefly to Rome) of money, and there was a vast amount of it. But what most deeply stirred the German people and did incalculable harm to the Church was the revelation that large monasteries, in some cases whole provinces of monasteries, especially of the philanthropic and educational sort, were comprehensively corrupt and guilty of seduction of their young charges.

For the year 1936 I read the accounts of the trials in four leading German papers, and these papers, two of them (in Westphalia and Rhineland) with four Catholic readers to one non-Catholic, fully approved of the trials, and expressed their deep disgust at the state of the monasteries. The scandals were chiefly in these two Catholic provinces and Bavaria, so that the courts, judges, officials, and police were Catholics. Every witness was a Catholic, and nine out of ten of the accused monks—I read a case of at least one nun—pleaded guilty. This was not in the hope of getting a lighter sentence—if one can imagine 300 monks of one province falsely saying, in the hope of lighter treatment, that their monasteries were steeped in vice—for the first monk to be tried (the priest-confessor of the monastery) confessed his guilt and got one of the heaviest sentences. In other cases ordinary priests corrupted boys in the confessional. One priest at Munich was convicted of discussing the scandal with girls of twelve or thirteen in the confessional.

I have no doubt that Hitler set the law in motion, for the scandal had been known or suspected (as a lady of one district told me) for years, but, as the German Catholic papers showed, there was no question about the integrity of the courts. Hitler did not mean merely to make a sardonic retort to the Catholics who expressed horror at the prevalence of sodomy in the Nazi ranks. His quarrel with the Church was mainly over the education of the young in Catholic schools and colleges and the organization of them in fraternities. There is your Catholic education for you, Goebbels now shrieked to the country. In Catholic Munich Hitler ordered a plebiscite in which Catholic parents should vote whether they preferred National or Catholic schools for their children. In spite of the priests the pupils in Catholic

schools fell from 36,464 to 19,266, and the proportion in Nationalist schools rose from 33 to 65 per cent of the whole body of children. It was Catholic parents who forced the police to prosecute the priests who corrupted their children in the confessional.

So scandalously is public instruction conducted today that the public, not having the slightest suspicion of the enormity of the exposure that angered many German Catholics, were easily duped by Catholic propagandists about the nature of their criticism of Hitler. In the circumstances it would have been amazing if there had been no murmurs among the priests and none had gone to jail or to the concentration camp. The propagandist quotes these as his evidence that the Catholics were the only body in Germany to oppose Hitler. He relies upon the ignorance of the public that the Socialist and Communist bodies had been bloodily suppressed, and he prevents us from telling on what very serious ground Hitler got the sympathy of the German people in his attack on Catholic schools and institutions. But what was the attitude of the higher clergy, who take their instructions from Rome?

Two weeks after his seizure of the Rhineland, Hitler appealed to the people to say by plebiscite whether they approved of what he had done from 1933 to 1936. Everybody knew what he had done. They had seen the horrors of the persecution of the Jews. Martha Dodd, daughter of the American ambassador in Berlin, describes them candidly in her book *My Years in Germany* (1939). The world had not to wait for the war to see the brutality of which the S.S. (now replacing the original S.A.) and the Gestapo men were capable. Tens of thousands of the Jews were shot, beaten to death, or sent to the camp. By the end of 1934 about 100,000 of them, completely beggared, had left the country to escape the foulness. They were forced to scour the toilet-pans for the soldiers with their hands and then forbidden to wash their hands before eating. They were, Miss Dodd says, " knocked down to a kneeling position and forced to open their mouths while the guards urinated in them." They were made to dance naked between pails of ordure, had their pubic hair singed, had lighted cigarettes thrust down their throats, and so on. Communists had been treated much the same, and Socialists little less brutally. By 1936 Hitler had a monstrous army, and boasted all over Germany what he was going to do with it. He had special schools in which youths—his future sadistic Gestapo—were trained in callousness and brutality, and he had prostituted the whole system of education to his military aim. On the constructive side he had done nothing. His German biographer, Olden, says :—

> The poverty which the Chancellor of the Presidial Cabinet (before 1933, a Catholic working with the Socialists) had brought to the German people was wealth compared to the distress to which Hitler condemned them.

Our impartial *Annual Register* said :—

> World history cannot show any revolution which produced so few actual results as that of the Nazis since their rise to power.

It is wrong in one respect. In no other revolution in history had half a dozen leaders accumulated such large fortunes in three years.

A few days before the German people had to give their verdict on this unholy record of achievement a letter written by the Catholic bishops on the subject was read from every pulpit in Germany. The people were to vote for Hitler. The bishops recognize that the faithful must feel a painful conflict of conscience, not on account of the record of brutality, but because " measures antagonistic to the Church had been passed." But, the bishops say, " we give our vote for the Fatherland, but that does not signify approval of matters for which we could not conscientiously be responsible " (*Catholic Times*, March 27, 1936). Doubtless this was a very polite reference to the horrors I enumerated in the last paragraph. But the vote had left no room for discrimination. It was *Ja* or *Nein* to all that he had done. The bishops bade them say *Ja*. Please yourself if you want to think that the bishops acted without instructions from Rome. It is not the Catholic way.

But that they did receive such instructions is more than suggested by their next message, read from every pulpit, to the people. By September the lid had been taken off the Franciscan monasteries of Westphalia, and all Germany reeled from the stench. On September 12, 1936, the *Nazionale Zeitung* published this letter, and extracts of it were translated in the *News Chronicle* two days later. The letter begged Hitler to withdraw these proceedings and all action against the Church and allow Catholics to co-operate with him in " the fight against the ever-increasing threat of world Bolshevism, which shows its sinister hand in Spain, Russia, and Mexico." As I quoted in the preceding chapter, Cardinal Pacelli had put just that language into the Pope's mouth only a week earlier. Hitler did not respond, and in November (*The Times*, November 4) Mussolini advised him that it would help them to set up " a clerical state " in Spain and help him to annex Austria if he would come to terms with the

Church. Cardinal Faulhaber saw Hitler and again offered the co-operation of the bishops in his plans if he would keep his hands off Catholic schools. It reminds us of Pope Victor in the second century going to the very picturesque harem of the depraved Commodus to ask his most blatant mistress to persuade him to spare the Church. But Hitler's Minister of Education told him that the Catholic body was now too small and weak to require notice (*The Times*, November 17). The Catholic schools were nationalized at the New Year.

In 1937, when vice trials of priests and monks were breaking out in all parts of Germany, Hitler heard that Cardinal Mundelein of Chicago was telling America that the charges were Nazi fabrications, and he asked the Pope to silence him. The Pope refused. It was the only defence outside Germany that the Church had; and, not to put too fine a point on it, Mundelein had become the most generous of the Vatican's local collectors of funds. But the German bishops themselves presently blunted the edge of Mundelein's untruthful statement. Bishop Count Preysing, the aristocratic head of the Church in Berlin, wrote to Hitler in the name of the German bishops saying that they " do not deny that in certain orders of lay brothers members have been drawn into a sphere of serious moral perversities " (*The Times*, July 3, 1937). This was bad enough, for in the Westphalian province of some 400 Franciscan monks, for instance, 276 were convicted of sodomy and imprisoned, while sixty-one fled the country rather than face trial; and these monasteries had been periodically examined by Roman officials, who had learned the facts. But what Count Preysing said about the clergy was worse; though this was the Catholic defence abroad from that time. He said that, after all, only fifty-eight of the 25,635 secular (or non-monastic) priests of Germany were arrested for vice. Naturally. They could not be arrested or charged with normal misconduct with women (servants, etc.), because it is not an offence in German law. Sodomy is a monastic vice. Moreover, the figure fifty-eight is a gross understatement, as I found in reading the law reports in the German papers.

It was at the end of 1937 that the Pope first ventured to complain, in his Christmas message, of the conduct of the Nazis. Their destruction of democracy, their brutalities during the last four years, their vile prostitution of education, and the open preparation for aggressive war he ignored. They had, he said, persecuted the Church on the grounds that it interfered in politics. " How could any fair-minded man suggest such a thing? " the Pope asked with subdued indignation. Educated Catholics really astound us. The Pope may not have put Hitler in power,

as the Catholic Thyssen said, but, as we saw, he had a material share in the destruction of German democracy. His Church loudly supported the vote of confidence on the first and the third anniversaries of Hitler's accession to power and the illegal seizure of the Rhineland. The Pope and the whole Spanish Church were, we saw, at that very time deep in politics, against the interest of the people in Spain, and they were preparing the way for Hitler to destroy the democracy and the liberty of the people of Austria and of Czecho-Slovakia.

This rape of Austria and the Church's share in it will be considered in a later chapter, and the still more obvious share of the Vatican in the shameful betrayal of Czecho-Slovakia also will have to be treated in a separate chapter. In Germany itself the Catholics were just one-fifth of the general population who had to behave themselves, from the Nazi point of view, like any others, and a number of the ordinary priests went to camps for displaying the moral courage which their Pope lacked; but their criticisms were almost entirely sectarian, not directed against the brutality and degradation of the Nazi regime. The Vatican could only hope to recover sufficient influence to protect the Catholic schools (which had given the same corrupting military education as the Nazi schools) and associations by helping Hitler's plan of aggression in Europe. The most effective step in preparation for the war was the destruction of Czecho-Slovakia, which, as I said, stood like a Gibraltar on the route to the Ukraine. The Church was of vital usefulness to Hitler in this. Its policy in regard to Poland is obscure, as we shall see. Possibly here Hitler duped the Vatican, but, to the great embarrassment of Catholics all over the world, the Pope was almost silent when the Nazis fell upon Poland and precipitated the great war. It is true that in January 1940 the Pope complained bitterly of outrages in Poland, but he referred particularly to Russia, merely remarking that, " these outrages were not confined to the districts under Russian occupation." There is a scandalous contrast between the white heat of the Pope's language when Russia, after a peaceful offer had been refused and the secret alliance of Männerheim and Hitler became known, took over part of Finland, and the tameness of his few words of protest when Germany, with not an atom of justification, fell upon Poland, Holland, and Belgium.

The fact is that, with the full connivance of the Vatican, the Catholic Church in Germany as boisterously supported Hitler's great crime as did the Nazi Youth. At the end of 1939 the bishops, at their annual meeting at Fulda, decreed that " after the completion of the final German victory special ceremonies of gratitude to the German troops and of loyalty to Hitler will be

announced." Some British and American papers said that the bishops wanted to hold these ceremonies at once, but the Vatican feared that this would have a dangerous repercussion in Britain, America, and France. Of the Pope's routine praises of peace and tears over the horrors of war no one took the least notice, especially as on the only occasion (December 1939) on which he stepped down from the cloudy level of platitude and made specific proposals, the first of them was the right to life and freedom of all nations, big and small, powerful and weak. This was too ironic in view of what he had notoriously done in regard to Manchuria, Abyssinia, Albania, Spain, Austria, and Czecho-Slovakia. Probably no one laughed louder than Hitler.

There is, in fact, as I showed in the first chapter, ground to think that the broad plan of the Nazi–Fascist–Japanese plot to conquer and exploit half the world may have been confided to Pius XII. Von Papen had a long conversation with him on the eve of the meeting in the Brenner Pass at which Hitler and Mussolini made the final decisions. From his familiarity with *Mein Kampf* and Hitlerism in Germany, he must in any case have known it on the broad lines on which I predicted the war in 1937. In 1938, when the London Press was expressing bewilderment as to "what Hitler really wants," I extracted the clauses of his programme in his own words from *Mein Kampf*, arranged them in order in a short article, and sent this to the editors of the two most radical London dailies. Neither would publish it. There is no excuse for anybody who professes that he did not know the plan of Germany, Italy, and Japan any time after 1934. In helping the conspirators in every direction to the invasion of Poland the Pope contracted a large share of the war-guilt. After that he could not, if he would, have arrested the avalanche. But through the National Church of Germany and Italy he blessed it. On May 24, 1940, the *Manchester Guardian* said :—

> The National-Socialist State has, it seems, been able to reach a new understanding with the Catholic leaders. . . . In spite of the persecution of laymen and priests by the Nazis, in spite of all the attacks on the Christian religion, new hopes have been raised among the German Catholics as a result of these negotiations.

They applauded every step that the German armies took. When Hitler ignored them, they appealed to Rome, adding, however, that they "would not say anything that would turn aside the energies of the people or prejudice their devotion to their country." And the Pope, in murmuring again about the horrors of war, said that he was "anxious not to create the impression

that the Church favours the enemies of Germany." A moral judge who is neutral when criminals array themselves against civilization shares their crime.

The alliance continued as long as it looked as if the Axis plot might succeed; until, that is to say, the Soviet troops turned back the red tide in Russia, and men wondered. In the summer of 1941 we heard that the German bishops as well as the Pope ventured to criticize Hitler, though again only for persecuting the Church; but, as *The Times* pointed out, they added that "a victory over Bolshevism would be equivalent to the triumph of the teaching of Jesus over that of the infidels." They knew well that this victory over Bolshevism would enable Hitler to bring all his forces west, and possibly successfully resist Britain and America. But the view from the Vatican tower was unsettling. In July, when the Papal authorities were so scrupulous about giving the impression that they favoured the enemies of Germany, the German troops were pouring over Russia in a tidal wave that, apparently, could not be checked this side of the Urals. In October Ribbentrop asked the Nuncio in Berlin to put new proposals before the Pope, and he refused (*News Chronicle*, October 5). The tidal-wave had been stopped, though, as it transpired, only for a time. If anybody thinks that a Papal Nuncio would take such a step without instructions from the Vatican he does not know much about the Church.

Notice the dates. In January 1941 Germany invaded Russia like a torrent, sweeping everything before it until the winter. In December the Japanese attacked at Pearl Harbour. The Vatican vacillated; in fact, once the Americans declared war it said nothing further that could be construed as favouring the "Axis." In November 1942 the German tide broke against Stalingrad, and the Germans were in flight after Alamein. The Pope now became really neutral. In July 1943 the Americans were in Sicily, and the defeat of Germany by Russia was certain. The Pope was very silent except for his annual chant of the beauty of peace, which he had not forgotten even while mounds of corpses stank from the Volga to the Atlantic. He now suffered from extinction of the voice; which gave the Catholics of Britain and America time to revise their defence of the Papacy. Their main policy now was to see that the Press buried the facts. The only sincere note in their apologetic was that the Pope had had above all to act in the interest of the two finest branches of his Church in Europe: the German and the Italian. We agree—on the lines of Vatican policy. All other interests of humanity and civilization must be sacrificed to the interests of the Church.

After a time it was possible to talk as loudly as ever, without a

blush. Had not the Pope said from 1936 onward that the supreme aim was to exterminate Communism and Socialism? Hitler and Mussolini had betrayed their sacred oath; America, Britain, and France took up the flag they had trailed in the gutter. The Vatican was warmly welcomed into the new crusading alliance. Its minority in each country west of the Iron Curtain received new uniforms: Christian Democrats, Reform Republicans, People's Party, and so on. Conservatism was discredited as Fascist or semi-Fascist in every country. Liberalism, largely discredited by collaboration, was too feeble to count as a separate force in politics. Radicals were not free from the taint. But they could all wear the new livery of Freedom and Democracy and march under banners that had no Papal symbols on them. America and the Vatican began to run the new Europe. When the time is ripe, of course, the Vatican hopes to do better. Bavaria, Austria, and other Catholic areas are to be the Central European Catholic League of Nations under King Rupert of Bavaria; Hungary and Czecho-Slovakia might in time be forced into the union. France, Belgium, and the South European Catholic Empire (Spain, Portugal, Italy) will co-operate with it and with Great Britain when America sounds the bugle for the grand attack on the Soviet Union and its allies. So Rome thinks.

Meantime there is little of interest to us in the condition of political life of Germany. In the Russian-occupied zone a fusion of Communists and Socialists governs, and the Vatican is excluded. The Bi-zone is an economic arrangement in the main, though partly an American device for dictating policy in the British-occupied zone. From our present point of view the Western provinces are much as they were. In the zones under America and France the Christian Democrats (Catholics and any who think that the Church will save the economy of private enterprise) are the great majority. In the British-occupied zone the Social Democrats prevail in the non-Catholic provinces. In Berlin at the election of 1947 the Social Democrats got 48 per cent of the vote, the Socialist-Communists 20 per cent, the Christian Democrats or anti-Socialists 22 per cent. It is all provisional, awaiting, many think, the issue of a mighty conflict of Religion-and-Private-Enterprise with Socialism-Communism, which would make the Second World War look like a college rag. But there is no evidence of a growth of genuine Catholicism. When misguided clerics resuscitated the old Catholic Centre Party at the election it "also ran."

CHAPTER VI

SELLING FREEDOM IN SOUTH AMERICA

THERE is in the British Museum Library a fascinating book on South America (*Noticias Secretas de America*) which was published in London in 1826 but never translated into English. I believe that it was written by two Spanish scientists who, out of respect for the Inquisition, did not care to put their names to it. They had been sent, about the middle of the eighteenth century, on a government mission of inquiry to Peru. These Spanish observers describe the whole population, "Europeans, Creoles, bachelors, married, and secular and regular clergy," as completely indifferent to the Church's teaching about sex. Nearly all the Franciscan friars, for instance, get chaplaincies or other sources of income and set up homes of their own. If you looked through the windows of one of the poorer of such houses you might see the friar-father, in brown robes and shaven poll, washing the baby's diapers or, in the better houses, giving a feast to neighbours in honour of the christening of his latest child; or, they say, you might see the more important friars making their way merrily with wife and children to some town where the annual conference of the Order was to be held.

Thus did the fragrance of the Middle Ages linger in this sheltered world until middle-class young men who had been sent to Madrid, Paris, or the United States for education, brought into it the withering poison of Voltaireanism. After twenty years of struggle in the first half of the nineteenth century, Spain and Portugal lost their empire, and the clergy and monks, at least in the cities, were severely curtailed in their liberties; though a long letter I received some years ago from an engineer in one of the small provincial towns had the full flavour of the *Noticias Secretas*. But the men of the middle class, the Liberals, had become bitterly anti-clerical, and opened the long story of Latin-American democracy, punctuated by revolutions as some vigorous soldier or ambitious priest fired the densely ignorant Indian troops with a fear that their holy religion was in danger. Buenos Aires, Rio de Janeiro, Valparaiso, and Lima became a paradise for rich sceptics instead of poor friars.

Finding, however, that industry is even more profitable than agriculture, the Liberals began to provide manufacturing enterprises and modern transport. They thus created masses of urban

workers who demanded education and then cheap translations of radical European literature. When the news of the Bolshevik Revolution of 1917 broke upon them, radicalism received a mighty impulse. Whole shiploads of Communist and Socialist literature reached South America, and the ideas they preached spread more rapidly even than in France and Italy. Naturally Mexico, connected with the States by a bridge over the Rio Grande, made the speediest advance. I crossed the bridge from Texas one Sunday morning in 1926, and was at once stimulated by two piquant spectacles. The first was a stream of girls, dressed in black and with prayer-books in their hands, walking very decorously from the brothel quarter (which flourished on American dollars) to hear Mass in the parish church. The second was that of a crowd of men—one would say all the male adults of the little town of Ciudad Juarez—holding a noisy Labour meeting in the plaza in front of the church while the priests entertained the ladies inside it. I went on to Mexico City.

But as the combined efforts of the American Knights of Labour and Wall Street have not shaken the power of the Socialists in Mexico, I need not say much about it. I travelled from the Rio Grande to the south of Yucatan, visiting the Toltec and Aztec ruins, and found much Socialism everywhere—the Trade Unions were particularly strong in the ancient land of the Mayans—and the Church very subdued, except in the villages and provincial towns like Oaxaca and Pueblo. Yet America had been co-operating with the Vatican for years. Professor J. L. Mecham says in his *Church and State in Latin America* (1934) that Catholics have pressed Washington to intimidate Mexico from 1925 onwards, and both Washington and Wall Street were eager to co-operate in the restoration of religion. The mountains of Mexico are, an American engineer told me as we swept by them on a train, believed to hold considerable quantities of mineral wealth, to say nothing of the oil-fields of Tampico. Another American engineer with whom I travelled for several days assured me that America has no designs on Mexico. A few days later I overheard him say to an American lady who resided in Merida (Yucatan) that "of course we'll take over Mexico sooner or later."

But I must be content here to give one illustration of the way in which the Vatican works for the extinction of Bolshevism. In 1927 I received from America a little book with blood-red paper covers. It was an appeal to Wall Street on the ground of awful outrages in Mexico, and gave a list of the priests executed in 1926, when I was there. No such outrages had occurred. The only violence in Mexico City was that one day, to embarrass

the Government, the wives of the Catholic ambassadors organized, through their servants, a demonstration of Catholic women, who flung large stones at the police. The police merely sent for the fire-brigade and they turned their hoses upon the walls and let the water fall back upon the women. In Cuba a few weeks later I read articles in the leading clerical-conservative Havana daily by a Catholic Mexican journalist indignantly protesting that the stories of outrages were lies. T. Austin Smith, an American business man who travelled in Mexico, said the same in the New York *World Telegram* when new stories were invented in 1935 (just after Cardinal Pacelli's visit to Latin America and Chicago). Another Mexican Catholic, Moreno, told in the *Forum* how real and revolting outrages were committed by the bands of ignorant peasants (*Cristeros*) whom the priests organized to fight for the Church, and there is the same charge in Professor W. H. Calcott's *Liberalism in Mexico* (1931). The stories of anti-clerical outrages disseminated by the clergy are just the same as those they told about the Spanish Socialists and the Bolshevik Revolution of 1917, and had the same aim. They were the ground on which the Pope periodically appealed to the rulers of States—not by prayers, which are not the usual weapons of governments—" to extinguish Bolshevism in Mexico, Spain, and Russia."

Although the plot misfired in the case of Mexico, it is a significant part of Papal policy. In this case at least I was able to judge its foulness by personal observation. But we are here chiefly concerned with South America, as it was there that Cardinal Pacelli sold the liberties of the people by instigating military revolutions and dictatorships in the interest of the Church. I have, unfortunately, not travelled farther south on the American continent than South Yucatan and Cuba, but I will quote adequate first-hand authorities for my statements.

But first the reader must understand the importance to the Vatican of Latin America. The republics of Central and South America have a population of 90,000,000 people, and these, together with the 17,000,000 people of Mexico, are all counted Catholics and make one-fourth of the Church's preposterous claim of 400,000,000 members. I carefully estimated for the first edition of this book (1937) that the genuine total is about 200,000,000, and of these two-thirds are children or illiterates. Of the 70,000,000 or 80,000,000 Catholics in Latin America, about 80 per cent are entirely illiterate Indians. Indeed, vast numbers of them are still pagans, and further millions see a priest only when he makes his annual visit to their district to receive their contributions, which by custom and bullying they regard as obligatory. " Bacchus is their absolute and essential God,"

says Professor Mecham. That fine scholar Dr. Braga fully confirms this in his *Republic of Brazil*. Under Socialist or Communist governments in the larger republics these 80,000,000 " Catholics " would shed their religious garb far more easily than 100,000,000 Russians shed their Orthodox Catholicism in the ten years following the Bolshevik Revolution.

In South America an American Popular Revolutionary Alliance (A.P.R.A.), anti-clerical and based upon the common teaching of Socialists and Communists, swept the country between 1921 and 1930. So experienced a traveller and observer as Mrs. Rosita Forbes, who is no radical in politics, concluded after an extensive visit that " it is possible that the organization and methods of Soviet Russia may be destined to provide the machinery necessary to liberate the South American republics " (*Eight Republics in Search of a Future*, 1933, p. 7). No Liberals in the European sense could have any respect for the selfish rival politicians who had formed the governments and grossly neglected the mass of the people for years; still less for the greedy colonels and generals who occasionally led their ignorant troops to the capitals and seized power. A few Liberal statesmen gave education to the mixed Spanish-Indian workers, but the general idea was to dismiss the 50,000,000 or so Indians as ineducable cattle. Some of the forest tribes may be, but South Americans ought to know better than any that in the last 3,000 years the Indians are the only people who, in Yucatan and Peru, raised themselves to the level of civilization without any impulse from some other nation that was already civilized. For the middle class and the rich life was good. The shores of Rio and Buenos Aires were splendid with luxury and art, and these are based upon the labour of millions of Indians and *mestizos* in the vast and miserable background. This pleasant and providential order of things was now gravely threatened by the rapid growth of Communism and Socialism.

A.P.R.A.—the American Popular Revolutional Alliance, a union at first of Communists, Socialists, and Radicals—spread in every republic. We are apt to regard Peru as a hopelessly priest-ridden country, but by 1933, Mrs. Rosita Forbes says, " the educated youth of Peru was in the hands of Moscow." Other writers say, and it seems to be true, that the President of the A.P.R.A. was a candidate for the Presidency of Peru when the election came, and that he was actually elected but the authorities who would have lost their power altered the figures. Corrupt interference with the elections by both Liberal and Conservative Governments had been usual in Spain in the last few decades of the nineteenth century. One year a radical paper secured the

election results prepared by the Government and published them several days before the election occurred.

But from this time the confusion of parties became so great that I must keep to broad lines. The urban workers were, as I said, mostly of mixed blood, Indian and Spanish (Portuguese in Brazil), but the common idea of an American Indian is crude. There are many tribes, especially in the forests, which have never been civilized, but I have occasionally conversed with groups of Indians in Mexico and Yucatan, even in villages, and found the general level of intelligence of those who spoke Spanish hardly less than one finds in a group of such workers in Britain or France. By 1930 they were in the majority keen on their political rights and bitterly opposed to the Church. An American Protestant missionary wrote in the monthly paper of his organization that, while one heard an American worker call a man in a quarrel a "son of a . . . ," an angry worker in the South was very apt to call him a "poor Christ." About a third of these politically-minded workers wanted no interference with the economic order, and remained Radicals. The rest split as usual on the Marxian rock, and there were two or three varieties of Socialism and Communism. This advanced position was no more confined to the workers than it was in Germany or Italy, for university professors, with large bodies of their students, lawyers, and doctors, adopted Socialism or, in a few cases, Communism.

Their opponents were at first equally divided. The bulk of the middle class were Liberal descendants of the men who had fought with Bolivar and Balmaceda. They hated the Church and were pledged to democracy, while the rich landowners, the military men, and the clergy had no love of democracy, which had facilitated the growth of radicalism. After 1920 there had been a considerable influx of German and Italian merchants with Fascist ideas, and the Liberals were to a great extent disposed to sacrifice their democratic creed to these, but the clericals detested and suspected them. It was, you may remember, from South America in 1934 that Cardinal Pacelli wrote the only stern criticism of the Nazi leaders which he ever uttered—until they were dead. For several years before 1935 political life in most of the republics was lively and ever-changing. Military men took advantage of the situation repeatedly to head revolts, or to make a bid for wealth and power, and the dense ignorance of the rural soldiers and comparative simplicity of warfare—no tanks, planes, or big guns—encouraged them. The politicians, on the other hand, freely tampered with elections in the traditional Spanish style. There never was an entirely honest election in Spain, where Liberals and Conservatives alternated in office by

agreement, until 1932, and the effect of this democratic revolution was as terrifying to the South American clericals as it was stimulating to the radical workers.

Thus when I say that the Papacy sold freedom and democracy in South America, as it did in Italy and helped to do in Germany, I mean that its intervention was vitally important. Pacelli's visit in 1934 was—to use a scientific analogy—the factor that hastened the crystallization of all forces round two poles, Right and Left. As we saw, impartial observers in 1933 thought that the Reds had a good prospect of winning the whole southern continent. But Pacelli finally persuaded the wealthy middle class to sacrifice their anti-clerical as well as their democratic ideas and come under the clerical-military standard.

The mission of the Cardinal Secretary of State in 1934 was, of course, not political. As he would say in a later year, " How could any sensible man accuse the Church of interfering in politics? " He had interfered to the limit of his opportunity in Germany and Italy, in Poland and Spain, and he now saw a possible loss to the Church of some 50,000,000 members if the Reds captured the Government in the leading Latin American republics. He was also extremely busy watching the world in its new phase for the senile Pope. But he brushed aside all his affairs and took ship for Buenos Aires to preside at a religious festival, the Eucharistic Congress, in that city.

There was here a Conservative Government under the staunchly clerical General Justo, but radicalism was strong and active, and unless all anti-Socialist elements united and made it possible to use force, the future was very uncertain. They gave the Cardinal a gorgeous reception, and distinguished and wealthy Free-thinkers attended the religious services. The imprisonment and banishment of leading radicals followed, and at the next elections the Government tampered so notoriously with procedure and results that, as even the *Annual Register* observes, while the radicals registered progress, it would have been far greater " had the elections been conducted fairly."

But the Church and its allies have never been able to break the strength of radicalism in Argentina, where reaction cannot rely upon such a mass of ignorance in the provincial background as there is in Brazil. At the election in 1937, although " intimidation was freely practised by the Government " and in Buenos Aires there was a very general complaint of " the fraudulent character of the elections "—again I quote the objective testimony of the *Annual Register*—the radicals proved to be the majority in the capital, but were swamped by the provinces. In 1946 Colonel Perón, who was at that time considered " a semi-Socialist,"

became President, but he and his cabaret-actress wife have had to flirt with the workers to maintain his power. The semi-Socialist soon proved to be more than a semi-Dictator, but he has the support of the Church, which he established by law, as well as decreeing that in future none but a loyal member of the Church could become President or Vice-President, and greatly curtailing freedom of speech.

Brazil, with three times the population of Argentina, with potentialities in its vast territory that can hardly be exaggerated, is by far the most important republic from the Vatican point of view. If it became a secular State, as at one time seemed to be possible, the Vatican would lose at least 20,000,000, if not 40,000,000, followers in a few years. For its hold on the mass of the Indians, many tribes of whom are not civilized, is slight. In the small towns the clergy live and thrive as they did in the eighteenth century. In the thinly populated regions, which are, as Professor Braga says, "one immense hospital" for the Indians, there is only one priest to 50,000, in some cases 100,000, inhabitants. They see him only once a year, when he reels off a Mass to a vast crowd and then collects tribute from the men who have been brought together for the purpose. Rio, as all cinema-goers know, is a paradise for the rich. The vast hinterland is a paradise for the uneducated and loose-living priests, though a purgatory for the workers. But in Rio and in industrial areas like Sao Paolo the poisonous Bolshevik weed throve luxuriantly, and the paradise was threatened.

Dr. Vargas, whose character I have described, was elected President, in the familiar sort of election, in 1933, but waged an uncertain war upon Communism and Socialism until after the visit of Cardinal Pacelli. In 1935 there was a revolt, which was declared to be of Communist origin. The details give one the impression that it was the work of *agents provocateurs*, such as had been frequently used in Spain, but it was easily crushed, and the Dictator turned almost savagely upon his critics and those of the Church. There were 10,000 arrests. The jails were crammed and witnessed tortures that would have done credit to the Ages of Faith.

Of such developments as these which I am describing in the Latin-American world little is published, except smooth Government assurances, for the Press is rigorously censored, and some of our professors and humanitarian liberals too easily accept these or accuse us of excessive suspicion or of an uncritical acceptance of Leftist charges. In the case of this gravest of all the sequels of Cardinal Pacelli's visit we have sound evidence both that anti-Communism was used as a cloak to cover clerical outrages and

that torture was used. It is the *Annual Register* that tells us that 10,000 were imprisoned, and it goes on :—

> Among the prisoners were university professors and many other distinguished Brazilians belonging to the best society.

None of these were Communists, and the *Register* very moderately reflects that clearly the causes of the revolt " went far deeper than a few extremist ideas among some of the rank and file of the army." They were critics of the Church.

The fact that the prisoners were tortured became known in England in an exceptional but, in the circumstances, entirely convincing manner. In 1936 Viscountess Hastings and her sister Lady Cameron visited Brazil, and they were arrested as " spies for Moscow." They were soon released and the grotesque mistake was rectified, and on their return to England Viscount Hastings was moved to write a letter to the Press, in which he said :—

> In the prison they saw men and women who had been so badly beaten that they could only move with the greatest difficulty; a man's wife had been beaten insensible in front of him to make him confess; the hands of another man had been mutilated by having iron spikes driven underneath the nails. The prisoners were entirely cut off from the outside world, mostly ignorant of the charges against them and completely unable to get satisfactory legal and medical assistance. The day before my wife and sister were arrested the American boy Victor Baron was found dead in prison after " questioning." Actually reported in the Brazilian newspapers of the time were the complaints of the officers imprisoned in the Pedro I (jail) concerning the inhuman conditions under which they were detained.

So it had been in the Middle Ages and throughout the first half of the nineteenth century. My friend, Professor Tarrida del Marmol, member of an aristocratic Spanish family and a fine scholar, showed how these and even viler tortures (*Les Inquisiteurs d'Espagne*) were practised in Spanish jails (in which he had been incarcerated) at the beginning of this century under the Catholic Government. I have given the evidence as regards Portugal and Italy, and will later give it in the case of Poland under its Catholic dictatorship. Yet not only Catholic propagandists but humanitarian writers lightly dismiss all these facts as Communist fictions, while they just as lightly admit the real fictions of the clerical-conservatives.

I cannot here describe the development in detail in each of the

smaller Latin-American republics. By 1940 all but two of them were under military Catholic dictatorships or semi-dictatorships, while the Pope exhaled beautiful sentiments about the right of even small nations to self-government and liberty. In 1933 it had looked as if radicalism would enrol the entire southern continent: within six years reaction was triumphant, often truculent, from the Mexican frontier to Patagonia.

In spite of all the torture; imprisonment, and banishment, radicalism is again advancing and, if it secures power, the Church will pay for its share in the tragedy. It does not concern me here, but it is surely part of the tragi-comedy of our age that representatives of these harsh dictatorships are received with honour at the shrine of Freedom and Democracy in America; and most prompt of all of them to support any move of America that tends to widen or keep open the fatal split between West and East is the representative of Brazil.

CHAPTER VII

ROME RUINS AUSTRIA

In 1937 and 1938 I occasionally received a visit from one of the big German industrialists, proprietor of one of the engineering enterprises in the Ruhr area. A moderate Nazi himself, he was an intimate friend of Rosenberg, the best of the Nazi leaders, and Rosenberg, knowing my work as biographer of Goethe and English champion of Professor Haeckel, had the idea that I might possibly be persuaded to sympathize with their aims. I did in fact write a pamphlet in vindication of the place of the German people in the history of European civilization, against the reckless Romanism of Belloc and Chesterton, and I discovered only when it was published that I had been engaged to do so by a pro-Nazi agency in this country! However, my friend continued to visit me after I had assured him of my deep detestation of Nazism, and in the summer of 1938 he confided to me that at the time when Hitler marched into Austria the German Army had not sufficient petrol to maintain a war for ten days. Owing to the perfidy of French commanders and the incompetence of British and French statesmen, we threw away the chance of destroying in the bud the malodorous flower of Nazism and preventing its poison from infecting the world.

British statesmen at the time would probably have said that the Austrians as a whole seemed to welcome the *Anschluss*, the union of the German wolf and the Austrian lamb, or that the only folk in Austria who violently opposed it were the dejected and powerless Socialists of Vienna, Linz, and a few other cities. The fact that Hitler refused to take a plebiscite of the Austrian people and drowned their voice in the raucous chorus of the entire German nation ought to have warned them that they did not know the sentiments of the Austrians, which Hitler was afraid to ascertain; while for the large body of influential Austrian opinion that was in favour of the *Anschluss* the Vatican was primarily responsible.

In order to explain this I must summarize Austrian history after the First World War. Shorn, as was right, of the subject countries upon which it had relied for centuries—Hungary, Bohemia, Serbia, etc.—Austria was almost in the position, if it can be imagined, of a head deprived of its lungs and stomach.

For years its life had to be maintained by draughts of financial oxygen from the League of Nations. But the Church saw that it became a theocracy, the Chancellor being a cleric of high rank, Mgr. Seipel. Socialism, however, spread so rapidly that in 1929 its members captured, and held for ten years, the municipal control of Vienna and other large towns. They had at first a very heavy task in overcoming the economic difficulties. I spent a week in Vienna in 1922, and, roaming about as I always do in foreign cities, I fully realized the distress. For a few days I found myself a millionaire. At the frontier a little lieutenant with a very big sabre had very courteously demanded how much money I was bringing into the country. I was making my leisurely way across Europe to Athens and Crete and, being unable in London to book beyond Vienna on account of the daily fluctuations of exchange, I had more than £20 in my pockets, so, to the horror of the officer and the crowd, I had to declare something over 5,000,000 kronen. The krone was normally two shillings. The distress of the workers in such a situation can be imagined; for, the police officials assured me, half of them had only the equivalent of eighteen-pence a week, and the other half nothing. One day, standing in a crowd of workers on the steps of the Opera House, I saw the sabres of the mounted police flash in the sun as they threatened to charge, and I ran with the crowd. Vienna, a police inspector told me, was in their opinion on the edge of civil war. I was at the time special correspondent of the *Star*, and could obtain information.

I recall these experiences because, while the "Christian Socialist" Government—it had, of course, no element of Socialism—was impotent and blundering, the Socialist Council of Vienna did a remarkable job of restoration and education and was extending the work to other large towns. But I will be content to quote the verdict of non-Socialist historical writers. J. H. Jackson says in his admirable history of post-war Europe that they made Vienna "a model city." C. S. Macartney, a conservative Cambridge scholar, says in his *Social Revolution in Austria* (1926) that they "did more to better the condition of the masses than had previous decades of legislation from above," or from the national government. Indeed, the anti-Socialist *News Chronicle* (February 12, 1935) rose to a lyrical note when the Catholics destroyed this city-government, and said that it had been "a model of democratic government, as close to the ideal Platonic Republic as the world has ever seen." The only criticism was from the rich, who were heavily taxed. The statement, made at the time and often repeated, that the loans from the League of Nations were used is false. They were loans to the

Christian Socialist Government, which spent them on the rural and small-town two-thirds of the country.

Macartney says :—

> Even to this day (1926) the real battle of Austrian Socialism is directed against the Church; its domains are the ground which has been wrested or reclaimed from her (p. 54).

And just as certainly the Vatican policy I am tracing required the destruction of Austrian Socialism, however beneficent it might be socially. The Church had had a very broad base in the peasantry and derived great strength from the rich and the middle class: the familiar combination. But in the ten years' struggle (1922–32) it steadily lost ground. In 1927 the Socialist vote at the municipal elections rose by 120,000 in Vienna and by 90,000 in the country. Mgr. Seipel then began to persecute and hamper the Socialists, yet in the General Election of 1930 the Socialists won seventy-two seats and the Catholics, who were heavily discredited by financial scandals, only sixty-eight. Seipel was in league with the pro-Italian Fascists, under Prince Starhemberg, who was allowed to enlist a private army to harass the Reds.

Many will remember how at that time, or after 1933, we spoke about "the gallant little Dollfuss" and his defiance of Hitler. Few realized that Dollfuss, who succeeded Seipel, challenged Hitler only because he himself was a Fascist; and the Vatican, which already dreamed of a great Southern Catholic Federation of Italy, Austria, Hungary, France, Spain, and Portugal, still looked to Mussolini, who regarded Austria as in his sphere of influence. The *Annual Register* for 1932 says :—

> The picturesque legend created abroad of a united little Austria headed by its Chancellor in a gallant fight against destruction by a big German bully bears little relation to fact.

The Socialists, seeing the enlistment of an army by Prince Starhemberg, who made no secret of his aim to destroy them, began to make secret stores of arms, so Dollfuss ordered the seizure of the Socialist arsenals, largely with the aid of the Austrian Fascist guns. The Socialist railway workers had betrayed the fact that Italy, with the connivance of Dollfuss, was secretly supplying Hungary, under its Fascist dictator, with arms, and that, when Dollfuss untruthfully promised France and Britain that he would suppress the traffic, which went through Vienna, it still continued. So, as the *Annual Register* said, "the watchdog had to be destroyed." There was gallant but feeble fighting, for the Socialists and Communists now split, and Dollfuss and Starhemberg (with

his private army, the Heimwehr) fell bloodily upon the entire Socialist body.

"Thus," says the *Annual Register*, which almost seems to forget its policy of strict impartiality as it tells the tragic facts, "culminated the anti-Socialist policy inaugurated by the late Mgr. Seipel in 1926." Dollfuss, treacherous to the end, announced to the world that only 137 actual rebels had been killed. An Austrian journalist with the pen name Pertinax shows in his *Oesterreich* (1934) that about 1,500 were shot, 1,188 imprisoned, and eleven leaders hanged. By the end of 1934 there were 1,905 Socialists and Communists in the jails, and they were tortured by the Catholic authorities. When the humanitarians Miss Margery Fry, Mrs. Rackham, and Professor Kimberg attempted in 1937 to discover what truth there was in the complaint of the use of torture in the Fascist jails of Europe, the Austrians refused them permission to visit the jails. But the truth became known; vile forms of torture were extensively used. One more item was added to the historical truth about revolutions: popular revolutions are rarely bloody or followed by reprisals, but clerical-aristocratic recoveries of power are generally bloody and followed by savage reprisals.

With the destruction of the Socialist welfare-administration and their scheme of education, which had drawn eulogies from educationists in all countries, Austria fell back into a condition of misery. It is said in the *Annual Register* that the priests forbade the Government to share out the relief funds it received from abroad, so as to compel the workers to have recourse to Catholic organizations. The Church was triumphant, the people beggared once more; and the gallant little Dollfuss was murdered by an Austrian Nazi. From that year Fascism waned in the country and Nazism grew rapidly in strength. With its usual versatility, the Vatican transferred its patronage to the Nazis. In 1934, when the Viennese Nazis had murdered Dollfuss, they had seized the Government office and, in the lordly Nazi way, had announced that Austria had returned to the unity of the Motherland. Mussolini, who moved three divisions to the frontier, was outraged. He still at that time despised Hitler as an upstart who aped his own imperial dignity. The Fascist papers in Italy poured scorn on these "murderers and sodomists" of Berlin, and said that the Fascists would "not negotiate on a footing of moral equality with people who fail cynically to respect the laws of honour." Hitler's move was premature. Starhemberg's Fascist army (equipped with Italian arms) drove the Black Shirts out of Austria, and the Government made a drastic attack on all its critics. By the end of 1935 there were more than 20,000 political

prisoners in the jails of Austria, and torture was used to compel the betrayal of others. In my *History of the War since 1918*, in 1937, I wrote :—

> Today a beggared, bewildered Austria, hovering between the Italian and the German bully, taking crusts from both, nervously awaits the hand of Fate.

To this pass the Christian Socialists, undoubtedly directed from the Vatican, had brought the once-proud Empire, its beautiful capital, and its most attractive people after their "triumph" over the capable Socialist administration. In only one other State, Czecho-Slovakia, in the present century besides Austria have priests held political power; and they ruined it, as they ruined Austria.

Mussolini still protected the country, and the Vatican was in alliance with Mussolini. How did it come about that when Austria was destroyed three years later the Roman Church in the country and the leading Catholics in the Government prepared the way for and heartily welcomed Hitler?

In 1935 Hitler, encouraged by the obvious reluctance to act of the Western Powers, defied them and raised his army to 550,000 men. The League of Nations Union in England had just concluded a purblind—its leaders were at least quite blind to Hitler's obvious aims—campaign for peace, with a plebiscite in which 12,000,000 voted, in effect, for peace at any price. A great speech, dripping with hypocrisy, by Hitler on his own and the German people's passion for peace was translated into English and French, and was almost universally accepted as sincere in America, Britain, and France. Mussolini was better qualified to detect hypocrisy. He began to use more conciliatory language, and the Black Shirts crept back into Vienna. Hitler expanded his theme and said in his speeches that Germany wanted peace, but, of course, peace with honour; and it was a dishonour to the Great German nation that 10,000,000 of its sons bent under the yoke of a foreigner (in Austria, Alsace, Poland, Czecho-Slovakia, etc.). Mussolini invaded Abyssinia, and Britain and France did nothing. Hitler invaded Rhineland, and they still did nothing. Both Hitler and Mussolini intervened in Spain on a decisive scale, and the Western Powers helped them. In short, Hitler disarmed the less shrewd Mussolini and encouraged him to seek adventure in Africa (part of the ancient Roman Empire) and induced him to advise the Austrians to turn to Germany.

Schuschnigg, who had succeeded Dollfuss as Chancellor, found himself in 1937 in a subtle Nazi combination which flattered and confused his very limited intelligence. The Catholic von Papen

was Hitler's ambassador at Vienna, and he introduced learned Germans and a charming countess—Hitler was shamelessly using this and other German ladies abroad—and created an atmosphere of German brotherhood. What chiefly interests us here, however, is that they got the Catholic Nazi Seyss-Inquart, whose character later appeared when Hitler made him Nazi Governor of Holland, admitted to a key position in the Cabinet. The Cardinal Archbishop of Vienna, Innitzer, was the leading figure in the circle.

At what date the Vatican swung its Austrian policy from Mussolini to Hitler we do not know, but by the beginning of 1938 Hitler had an assurance that the entire Austrian Church would support him in the annexation of Austria; and, again, any man who seriously suggests that it could take so momentous a step without the direction of the Vatican is ignorant of Roman procedure. Hitler now professed that 10 per cent of the Austrian nation oppressed the 90 per cent who ardently desired union with Germany, and the Berlin Correspondent of the *Daily Mail*, who was often a guest of Goering and was seen with Hitler in his car, got this published in the London Press.

The Vatican had prepared the way for the ruin of Austria when it had directed Dollfuss, who visited the Pope just before his final outrage, to crush Socialism and put 20,000 of the best men in jail; or, as we heard a neutral authority say, "kill the watchdog." It now proceeded to complete the ruin. Hitler dared not expose his own lie by taking a plebiscite in Austria alone. It must be a vote of the entire German people. The wolf was to say whether the lamb wished to enter its jaws. But Seyss-Inquart and the Church gave their cordial support to this infamous plot. We Britons will be held by the future historian to have had some share of the shame and the folly of this first step in the outrage that was to rain death and misery upon Europe for ten years, for at that time Britain and France—and probably Russia would have joined—could have driven the wolf back to its lair on the mountains with its tail between its legs. But it was a passive share. The Vatican took an active part, and the Vatican professes idealism.

I have at several critical passages in this story relied upon the evidence of the *Annual Register*, and will do so here. If any reader does not know the work, he can ascertain that it is the most objective chronicle of events, year by year, that is published in Europe and America. It frankly describes, in the words of the Press, the action of Cardinal Innitzer and the Austrian Church and the sequel at Rome. Hitler assured the Cardinal that he would scrupulously respect the rights of the Church; he assured the

Vatican that in return for help in Austria he would sweeten their soured relations in Germany. Innitzer ordered Catholics to vote for the man " whose struggle against Bolshevism and for the power, honour, and unity of Germany corresponds to the voice of divine providence," as he said. After his own signature to the plebiscite he added the words " Heil Hitler." And when Hitler marched in on March 14 the church bells rang and the churches were decorated with large swastikas. He stood by Hitler when he announced to the world that he had saved Austria from civil war and saved Europe from " a second Spain " by making an end of Schuschnigg's " most bloody and murderous brutality." Another man had forgotten his long spoon in dealing with the devil. I add with pleasure that the Cardinal Archbishop and the Pope had made the same mistake. Within a month Hitler fell upon the Church. It was disestablished. Its monks went to prison with the brand of Sodom. Within three months Innitzer was " confined to barracks." Perhaps he saw from the windows what friends of mine saw: young pregnant women scrubbing the pavement of the streets while Gestapo pansies stood round and jeered, and so on. The land had been delivered from the threat of Bolshevism.

There were British Catholics who were outraged and foolishly wrote to the Vatican to ask if it were true that the Cardinal had bade the nation bow down to Hitler. The fact was notorious, and the Papal organ, the *Osservatore Romano* (April 1), supported by the Vatican wireless, said that Cardinal Innitzer had acted on his own responsibility, and not consulted the Vatican. He had " not recognized the wolf in sheep's clothing"; as if Hitler had come as a stranger. American and British Catholics rejoiced, but the Nazis had something to say to this lie. So Pacelli, as Secretary of State, issued a message that the announcement in the *Osservatore* was not authorized. He as strictly controlled the paper and the radio as he ruled Cardinal Innitzer. But the Pope's English Catholic biographer, E. Rankin (*The Pope Speaks*, 1940), takes us a step further in the comedy. It seems that the message explaining that the Cardinal's action was unofficial was not itself official. He says :—

> It was characteristic of the extreme delicacy of the situation that the denial was not public but was telephoned to foreign correspondents by persons instructed by the Vatican to do so.

The " extreme delicacy of the situation " was that the Vatican wanted to assure Hitler that it had helped him to get Austria, yet persuade the other Powers that it had given no encourage-

ment to Hitler. The American columnist, Pegler, who always has an eye on the clerical police, nevertheless said publicly that the Vatican Press Bureau was as bad as that of Goebbels. There were many complaints that its clerical staff was venal and corrupt.

The fact that Cardinal Pacelli did not become Pope until the spring of 1939 makes no difference to this indictment. He was head of the Church as Secretary of State in the later years of Pius XI, and the policy was carried out still more ruthlessly when he obtained the Triple Crown. One of his first acts was to send friendly greetings to Franco, and the chief events of the year were the final destruction of Czecho-Slovakia, the rape of Albania, and the invasion of Poland and inauguration of the worst war in history. Spain, Austria, and Czecho-Slovakia had been just *hors d'œuvres* to the Nazi ogre. The Vatican left Austria in the deep misery to which it had helped to bring the fair but unhappy little country. The only post-war activity of its Church is to support America and Britain in their struggle to discredit radicalism in general and Russia in particular. The condition is that of a temporary chaos in which we can form no clear opinion about the position and prospects of the Church.

In Hungary, on the other hand, we already see the beginning of the ruin of Papal influence coinciding with a national resurgence. Democratic Hungarians had never forgotten the silence, if not acquiescence, of the Vatican when, in 1849, the Catholic Austrians had punished the hour of independence of the Hungarians with a savagery that made Protestant Europe shudder. They did not forget that during the next seventy years the Popes never uttered a syllable of condemnation of the Austrians for holding them in violent subjection. After the brief harsh rule of Bela Kun in 1919 the Vatican cheerfully saw the Hungarians pass under a new dictatorship, and although the dictator, Horthy, was a Protestant, he was throughout his rule in very cordial relations with the Pope. But Russia was the chief agent that liberated Hungary from the Nazis, and it naturally favoured those elements of the population, when it came to the hour of reconstruction, which would build more or less on the Russian model.

The only point that we need examine here is whether the recent action of the Church, which before the war claimed the allegiance of 60 per cent of the Hungarian people, was a patriotic effort, directed by the Vatican, to liberate the Hungarian people from a Communist regime which had been imposed upon them. Those who believe that behind the Iron Curtain Russia and her allies are preparing some monstrous armed aggression against Western Europe may here admire the action of the Church, but they can hardly at the same time dispute the nature of its action or doubt

that it was directed from Rome. The idea that we must not suspect Vatican influence unless we can quote Papal letters or open messages on the Vatican radio is as naive as the claim that when accused men plead guilty in Soviet or Hungarian courts they must have been treated with opiates or bludgeoned until even their heroic religious strength failed. The action of the Hungarian clergy in conspiring against a Communist Government was a loyal and logical effort to apply the policy which the Pope has poured over the world a hundred times. The Government, which clearly has today the allegiance of the majority of the Hungarians, even of large numbers of Catholics—hence the Vatican's anxiety—secularized the schools. Nothing more acutely inflames a Catholic prelate than a threat to his schools, and Cardinal Mindszenty heavily complained from the pulpit, and vowed resistance. The clergy thus, however conscientious you may call their conduct, laid themselves open to a charge of " subversive " action, to use the phrase which the American Government uses so drastically against Communists; though the American Secretary of State at once (*before the trial*) had publicly described the Government action as " a sickening shame," when Cardinal Mindszenty and others were arrested at the close of 1948. In fact the immediate outcry in both Britain and America, the solemn voice of religion mingling with the profane cry of the Press, might suggest that the Canon Law held good in both countries and a cleric could not be tried in a civil court.

Probably few, if any, of my readers will be aware that an English clergyman, the Rev. Stanley Evans, entirely free from the taint of political radicalism, witnessed the trial in Buda Pesth. He assures us (*The Trial of Cardinal Mindszenty*, 1949) that the trial was normal and fair, and the Cardinal was clearly guilty of treason and currency offences. He scouts the idea that any physical means was used to extort the confession which the Cardinal made at first, and suggests that he was directed by the Vatican to make it so that the full truth about British and American officials should not transpire in the course of the trial. When we read of the vast sums of money which the British and American Governments spend on Secret Service, and hear now that there are (a Minister said in the House) sums in the expenditure columns which must not be explained even to the Government officials appointed to check national expenditure, we should be surprised if it were otherwise. In a land where still about half the population are Catholic the priest seems to be the safest agent to employ in secret operations.

However, here, as usual in the case of recent events, I follow the *Annual Register* for 1949 and that equally impartial pub-

lication, Keesing's *Contemporary Archives*. Before the trial in February the Government published a confession, implicating the American officials, by the Cardinal. He was, he said, working for a union with Bavaria and Austria in a Central-European Catholic Monarchy (under Prince Ruprecht): which, as I have shown, was a notorious Vatican ideal. The bishops published an earlier letter in which the Cardinal warned Catholics not to believe a confession if he made one. The idea of earning the crown of martyrdom does not seem as popular as it once was in these hallowed circles. However, as the Cardinal in court made a vague and feeble statement that he had not been conscious of breaking the law and was sorry if he had done so, he again virtually admitted the facts. Keesing's *Contemporary Archives* is a series of quotations, without comment, from the leading (and generally Conservative) papers of Europe and America on the chief events of our time. On the Mindszenty case, which roused the joint Catholic and anti-Communist feeling throughout the world, it gives seven large columns of such Press opinions. There is not in a single line of these any suggestion of, or ground for suggesting, irregularity in the trial; and to make such a suggestion because the Hungarian Government refused the insulting demand of America and Britain that they should be officially represented at the trial is strange.

We shall see further trials in the chapter on Czecho-Slovakia. In a period such as that through which we are now passing every Power that may be involved in the terrible war which is threatened spends very large sums in secret inquiries and in causing disaffection among its potential enemies. It is public knowledge that America, Britain, and Soviet Russia do this. The facts I have given show that in Eastern Europe these secret agents or agents in the embassies and consulates have to a great extent worked through the local priests, who are obviously hostile to Governments which the Pope incessantly denounces as "Atheist-Communist" and diabolical enemies of the Church. We impute no crime to these American and British agents. It is part of the work that we employ and pay them to do. But I am concerned here with neither the ethical nor the political aspect of the matter. Our only interest is whether in these conspiracies, as they are from the national point of view, of local hierarchies in the interest of the Church we may see the Vatican pursuing its familiar policy in the only way in which it is now possible for it to get on "the other side of the Iron Curtain." There is not much room for difference of opinion.

CHAPTER VIII

THE VATICAN AND CZECHO-SLOVAKIA

You may say that the Second World War began either in Austria, Czecho-Slovakia, or Poland, but at least it was as inevitable as the setting of the sun when Hitler destroyed Czecho-Slovakia, and in this the Pope had as clear a share as in the ruin of Austria. The little country stood in the way of the realization of the aggressive plan to which Hitler had pledged himself from 1925 onward, and when in 1935 he raised his army to half a million in defiance of Britain and France and had all the resources of Germany at his disposal, it was obviously doomed unless larger Powers protected it. On challenge Hitler occasionally denied that the programme in *Mein Kampf* ("grind the French to powder," etc.) remained part of his real intention, but he never withdrew, and he often repeated at his vast open-air meetings, the boast that he meant to get the Ukraine for Germany, and get it by the sword. It was so obvious that Czecho-Slovakia must disappear for this purpose—as I pointed out in public lectures in London in 1936—that the Czechs sought alliance with France (the rotten core of which none of us suspected at that time), and Soviet Russia. With such allies, and the probability of Britain assisting them, the road to the Ukraine was closed north (by Poland) and south. So Hitler, as in the case of Austria, looked for a pretext to intervene which might give Britain and France an excuse for refusing to act.

Czecho-Slovakia, the remnant of the powerful mediæval Kingdom of Bohemia, consists of a solid core of Czechs (in Bohemia and Moravia), a robust enlightened folk who could not tolerate Papal dictation, and two weak Catholic wings; the Sudeten lowlands bordering Germany and Austria, and the province of the very backward Slovaks to the east. Here was Hitler's opportunity. He had, we saw, the German Church and the Vatican in such a condition by 1937 that they were ready to promise almost any service if he would withdraw his "persecution." He demanded, and got, Austria. He demanded, and the Vatican materially helped him to get, Czecho-Slovakia.

The people of the Sudeten or western fringe of the country were mainly Catholics under a Catholic leader, Henlein, a fussy nonentity. As the country had been under Austria until 1918 and the Austrians had hindered its development, Austrians and

Germans had infiltrated in large numbers into this rich area. To Hitler in his new role of Charlemagne these were a large fragment of the German race which was held in bondage and foully treated —his agents easily concocted the usual lying stories—by the alien Czechs. But the Vatican had a close and anxious interest in the country apart from its desire to conciliate Hitler. It was losing literally millions of subjects in Czecho-Slovakia. It illustrates the recklessness with which the editors of even the leading British and American annuals accept statistical statements from Catholic authorities that during a year or two before the war the *Statesman's Year-Book* and the *World Almanac* gave the number of Catholics in Czecho-Slovakia as 10,831,636 after giving the total population of the country as 10,500,000, and adding that there were nearly 4,000,000 of other creeds or with no creed !

Of these 4,000,000—more probably 6,000,000—the greater part had rejected the authority of the Vatican since 1920. In that year a very large body of the Czech priests and their followers had agreed to break with Rome and form an anti-Papal Czecho-Slovak Church, and the chief ground was disgust at the Papal policy which sacrificed the Czechs and all moral principles in the interest of the Papacy. Another very broad outflow was in the direction of Rationalism. Both their first President Masaryk and his son, and their successor, Benes, were outspoken Rationalists, and under their influence the Czech Rationalist body became, proportionately to the population, the strongest and most progressive in the world.

Of this development we have ample Catholic testimony. The *Irish Independent* (August 13, 1938) said, in an article on the subject, that " nearly a million people and two hundred priests left the Church in 1919 and 1920 " to form the Czech Church, and that in Bohemia and Moravia priests were now scarce and of poor quality. A special correspondent of the *Tablet*, the one English Catholic weekly to which one would pay serious attention, visited the country in 1936 and confirmed (October 31) that there had been an alarming movement of secession. He quoted an orthodox Czech priest saying to him :—

> " Up to 1930 [from 1920] nearly 1,900,000 left the Church and, while about 150,000 joined the Protestants and Orthodox Communities, the rest are without religion."

As the priest, in his bitterness, does not mention the millions who had set up an independent or anti-Papal Catholic Church or the million who had become Socialists or Communists—these polled 1,700,000 votes at the last pre-war election—his figure of

1,900,000 is far below the truth. By 1936 the Catholic body had fallen to about 7,000,000 or 8,000,000 in a population of between 13,000,000 and 14,000,000 people.

So much for the plea that the Vatican cannot have had any interest in Czecho-Slovakia that would dispose it to co-operate in the designs of Hitler. From Bohemia and Moravia what it regarded as the atheistic poison of the Prague Government was spreading into the Catholic Sudetenlands and infiltrating even into the charcoal forests and villages of Catholic Slovakia. Rome could save at least the large body of Slovak Catholics by securing autonomy for the province and virtually detaching it from Bohemia and Moravia. A separatist movement was easily propagated among the ignorant Slovaks, and it was led for some years by a priest, Father Hlinka. That this was Vatican-directed was betrayed in 1934 by the Pope's Nuncio, who encouraged it in a published letter. He was expelled from the country by the Prague Government on the express ground of interfering in politics, and the Vatican appealed to the French Church. We will examine in the next chapter how the French Church enjoyed a power out of all proportion to its numbers between the two world wars. Here it is enough that with the connivance of the opportunist Government it took advantage of the reliance of the Czechs on the French alliance to lead the Czech Catholics in a great demonstration of defiance. A French cardinal, assisted by prelates from Poland and Austria, presided at a huge Catholic gathering in Prague in 1935. So clearly was this directed by the Vatican that a writer in the (Catholic) *Revue des Deux Mondes* (August 1935) claimed that in this demonstration the Papacy had shown itself, above all the nations, an element of concord and understanding.

Although the continued agitation of the Slovaks and their priests for autonomy seriously distracted the Prague Government, it did not at this stage present a threat to the integrity of the State. Much more dangerous was the similar agitation in the western wing. Here the population, largely of Austrian or German descent and in close touch with the Austrian and German Churches, was more divided, and there were frequent quarrels. The Catholic leader, Henlein, was a man of no importance or strength, a school teacher, and he easily made the mistake of thinking that Hitler would help them to get autonomy, with Herr Henlein as head of the State, and be content to keep a benevolent eye on the Sudetenland. He openly visited Hitler, who gave him a series of demands to make to the Prague Government. They were impossible and were rejected, and Hitler sent five divisions of his new army for " autumn manœuvres " on the Czech frontier.

The Czechs held a line of strong fortifications on the heights some distance back from the frontier with four divisions, and requested the French, in virtue of their alliance, and the Russians, to prepare to help them.

Of the horrible betrayal of Czecho-Slovakia that followed I need say little here, as the Vatican was only indirectly involved. It was involved in the sense that France was induced by its Catholic commanders Pétain and Weygand to dishonour its alliance—the first step in its downward march under Catholic influence—and that Mussolini gave his personal assurance through Lord Runciman to Britain and France that he knew from Hitler that if they would permit him to occupy the Sudeten lowlands, with their predominantly German population, he would not advance a step farther. Pétain, the chief author of France's shame—and we shall see later his position in the Catholic world in France—said later that, first, Russia would not honour its obligations and, secondly, that even if it tried it had fatally weakened its army by executing some of its leading generals. That the Soviet army had not been weakened by the execution of a few traitors all the world saw later, and President Benes himself publicly stated that the Russians agreed to fight if the French did. Britain had no treaty of alliance with Czecho-Slovakia, but it had with France, and its statesmen threw away the second and last chance of averting the World War.

But it was in the final destruction of Czecho-Slovakia that the Vatican most clearly showed its hand. With revolting ease the Western statesmen listened to the treacherous Mussolini and allowed the German generals to fix their own frontier, obliterating the great chain of Czech fortifications. They still, however, restrained Hitler from pushing on to Prague, and he turned to Slovakia. Father Hlinka, who had had some patriotic loyalty, died in August (1938), and was succeeded in his political position by one of his clerical lieutenants, Father Tiszo, a type of man who prepared to follow any line suggested from Rome. He had not long before figured in a malodorous scandal as chaplain of a girls' school, and the whole of his career from this point reveals the poorness of his character. The Czechs made him Premier of Slovakia; the Pope gave him the dignity of Mgr. (or next to a bishop), and he became the white-haired boy of the Vatican.

The facts are so plainly given in Keesing's impartial summary of the Press for the next six months that I will state them briefly. Benes, whom Hitler hated, had been compelled to leave the country and had been succeeded by President Hacha. He deposed Tiszo for open treason in claiming independence for Slovakia, and that prelate fled to Germany with a batch of the

usual stories of Czech oppression and outrages. Hitler had used the Austrian Catholic traitor Seyss-Inquart as his intermediary with Tiszo, and this man took him, son of a Slovak peasant, to see Hitler at Berlin. From Berlin he informed his followers in Slovakia that Hitler would send troops to help them if they declared themselves independent. Hitler summoned President Hacha to Berlin, and told him that if he did not agree to the independence of Slovakia 700 German bombers would make a heap of ruins of the beautiful old city of Prague. He signed, and we shed tears over the disappearance of the brave little republic, one of our truest friends in Europe—and began to distribute our gas-masks. " It is the twilight of freedom in Central Europe," said the *New York Times*. One might object that while even our science cannot stay the onset of twilight, insight and courage could have prevented this. The great tragedy was now inevitable.

Tiszo returned with his tinsel dignity of President of Slovakia, and few will sigh on learning that one more Catholic had supped with the devil without a long spoon. His end, like that of Cardinal Innitzer and Seyss-Inquart and other pious quislings, was ignominious. Nor did Pope Pius XII—he was gloriously crowned in the same week in which Tiszo received his honours in Berlin—the Pope who thinks that " no fair-minded man would accuse the Church of interference in politics," reap the reward of his intrigue. History will record ironically that for a dozen years Catholics gave him the title of the Pope of Peace, *Lucus a Non Lucendo*, in the old Latin joke.

For a time Czecho-Slovakia returned to the faith. It was a land of blood, tears, and holy water. Like Mussolini, the Church went ahead " over the rotting corpse of freedom ! " Does that seem too strong? On February 10, 1941, the *New York Times* quoted this passage from the leading Czech Catholic paper :—

> There is no Catholic in Europe who would shed a tear to see the collapse of democratic political disorder and who would not sincerely welcome the fall of economic Liberalism, which has been denounced by the Pope's leading ideologists because it misuses the working people in favour of a few capitalistic exploiters.

Winter fell upon the new clerical paradise when the Hammer and Sickle at last appeared on the crests of the Carpathians. In time the Red Flag reached Prague, and the sturdy Czechs set about the restoration of the ruins. One of the first steps of Masaryk the younger, who returned to take the lead, was to get into touch with

Stalin. Clerical traitors like Tiszo were executed, and the Church was put in its place as just the creed of a large minority to which the State was indifferent.

We are concerned with the development of the last four years only in so far as it involves the Papacy through the action of the local Catholic Church, but, incidentally, the facts will help to make clear what precisely is the historical truth in the claim that Soviet Russia imposed a harsh Communist regime upon a reluctant democracy. For two years the country was ruled by a coalition of all parties. The provisional Cabinet contained three Catholics, six Communists, six Social Democrats, and five non-party men. It agreed upon the closest co-operation with the Soviet Union, but there is no complaint in any impartial document of any other Russian pressure than that of prestige; though this in itself, naturally, fostered the growth of Communism. A new constitution was drafted, and elections for the National Assembly were held. The results of this do not clearly indicate the religious situation, as the old clerical parties were banned. The Catholics (and many non-Catholic Anti-Socialists) called themselves Christian Democrats, while the Social Nationalists (Radicals), Social Democrats, and Communists formed a Workers National Block, which dominated the Czech provinces.

Grave trouble began in the latter part of 1947, when spirited preparations began for the 1948 elections, in view of which the Social Democrats and the Communists agreed upon co-operation on the lines that were common to them. Whether in the course of this struggle the Democrats (Catholics and anti-Socialists) hatched a conspiracy against the Constitution our *Annual Register* leaves open, and opinions will differ. But the same *Annual* presents it as entirely a quarrel among the Czechs themselves, and does not mention Soviet Russia, except in so far as it urged the Communists and Socialists to reject Marshall Aid, which was the primary argument of their Democratic opponents. We will hardly hesitate to assume that American agents did not fail to point out the importance to the country of this aid to restoration and the certainty that it would not be given if the Communists prevailed; and this coincided with the clerical policy. Nor will we hesitate to suppose that Soviet Russia did everything in its power, apart from military pressure, to encourage the Communists.

However that may be, the fact is that in February 1948 the Communist leaders issued a manifesto declaring that there was a conspiracy against the Government and calling upon the workers to be on their guard. They responded by setting up thousands of Action Committees, and these proceeded to attack and expel non-

Communists from all positions of influence (in business, industry, education, etc.). Their opponents retorted by withdrawing their members from the Cabinet—in order to precipitate the election, the Communists said—and when President Benes accepted their resignations, their places in the Cabinet were taken by Communists, who prepared a new and less liberal constitution. President Benes committed suicide, and Masaryk retired. A single list of candidates was presented at the election, and the elector had merely the choice of voting for the Government candidates or casting a blank vote. The *Annual Register* says that of 8,000,000 votes 7,000,000 were for the list, and 1,000,000 cast blanks. Keesing's epitome of the contemporary Press shows that 89 per cent of the people supported the candidates of the National Front and 10 per cent opposed them by casting blanks. This was the " Communist Coup " which, nearly three years after the war was over, brought the Czecho-Slovak economy into line with the Soviet system. It was not a military revolution.

We are here concerned with the allegations of Catholic clerical plotting that followed this coup in 1949. " Papal policy," says the French Catholic H. Marc-Bonnett in *La Papauté Contemporaine* (1945), " is one of those that are best concealed from the inquirer." That is true in the sense that secret directive communications from the Vatican to local prelates almost never see the light. If, for instance, we had suggested in 1916 that the Vatican had anything to do with the Easter Rebellion in Dublin our Catholic Press would have burst into laughter and scorn. Yet in 1933 (May 26) De Valera's paper, *The Irish Press*, boasted in an editorial that the Vatican was privy to and blessed the plan of rebellion. Count Plunkett (whose daughter the Irish bishops had, to please the English Government, openly censured for assisting the rebels) was sent to Rome by the Irish Volunteer Executive to tell the Pope of the decision to rise and the date of the insurrection. Plunkett, says the paper, received from the Pope, " the Apostolic Benediction on the men who were facing death for Ireland's liberty."

In the official life of Leo XIII by the Belgian prelate Mgr. T'Serclaes there are several examples of similar secret action on the part of the Papacy, though they are generally deals with Protestant governments to curb their Catholic rebels for a consideration. In the nineteenth century the Vatican had made such bargains with the British Government to crush the agitations of the Catholic Irish, and it had checked the Polish subjects of Germany at the price of concessions to it by the German Government. In more recent years it, as we shall see, obtained a great deal of its power in France by a bargain with the Government that

it should use its influence to check the chronic disaffection in Alsace-Lorraine.

The Vatican has always been ready to make these secret bargains. Even in helping conspiracy against a State it is not, it insists, interfering in politics, which it makes a solemn promise to avoid wherever it has a Concordat. It is just protecting its "rights." How violently these often (in the case of education, marriage, toleration) conflict with those of the body of the citizens who form the State we saw in the first chapter. In the matter of education, for instance, it demands as a normal right that it shall control all education. In a predominantly non-Catholic State—though it refuses to recognize a change of creed of the citizens who were once Catholic—this "right" takes the modest form of a demand that it shall build its own schools and the citizens shall then finance the Catholic teaching in them; but in proportion as the Catholic minority grows and its vote increases in importance (in Britain and America), its right takes the form of a demand that, while it very properly refuses to permit the existence of Protestant or secular schools in a Catholic country, the Protestant country with a sufficiently large body of Catholic voters shall take over the entire cost of Catholic education. Preposterous? "No," the Church's chief American expert, Dr. Ryan, blandly says, because "error has not the same rights as truth."

In view of these historical facts and notorious claims it is absurd to repeat the Catholic cry of "persecution of religion" in recent years in what are called the satellite countries beyond the Iron Curtain. In each of them we have heard of trouble analogous to that which we examined in the case of Hungary. The Press naturally endorses the cry of persecution; partly because of Catholic influence, but mainly because any stick with which to beat the Russian dog and its friends is welcome.

There are, in fact, relatively few in this portentous age of ours who can keep apart in their minds their political and their social or religious views and prevent a bias from spreading to one side or the other. When we attempt to do this we must perceive that, as far as Eastern Europe is concerned, the clear Vatican policy of today, which is to co-operate with the Western Powers in an effort to bring an end to what it calls Atheistic Communism, must chiefly take the form of intrigue. In the absence of any plausible ground to suspect the East of a design of military aggression, which half our best judges regard as impossible or suicidal, it is said that the fear is of intrigue and pressure. It would be ingenuous to suppose that the Western Powers leave all the intrigue to the Eastern Powers, and, just as the States have comparatively

safe refuges in " enemy " lands in their embassies and consulates, so the Vatican imagined that it had similar safe centres for intrigue in the archbishoprics. In the case of Archbishop Stepniak and Cardinal Mindszenty our Foreign Office and that of America, to say nothing of the Press, raised the cry of " outrage " and " persecution of religion " *before the trial began and we learned a word of the evidence.*

In the case of Czecho-Slovakia the grave trouble with the Church naturally did not begin until after the Communist coup, to which the Pope retorted by declaring all Communists and fellow-travellers excommunicated. I have told how the Communists had formed thousands of local Action Committees, and some of them were Catholic. A large part of the Catholic workers, feeling that there had been a real conspiracy of the middle class and knowing, on the other hand, that the Communists did not, as the Pope said, make atheism a necessary part of their creed, supported the new Government, as the bulk of the people did. Archbishop Beran thereupon (May 29) sent a letter to his priests saying that all Catholics who did this would be excommunicated. The Catholic Minister of Transport, Alois Petr, replied to this urging Catholics to join such Committees under the protection of the People's Party (Communist and Socialist). Beran retorted with a declaration that Catholics who did this would be a schismatical body—no one attempted to interfere with their creed—and threatened them with excommunication. The police raided Beran's palace, virtually imprisoning him and arresting some clerical members of his staff; and the people, obviously his own people, though the Press abroad said Communists, shouted down the archbishop in his own cathedral. The Pope erupted in anathemas, and the national branches of the Church rang with abuse, which the general Press copied, of the " atheist government " and its persecution of religion. A number of priests had joined their people in supporting the Government, but in the course of the year they submitted, as the alternative was ruin.

Thus a Government which had included Catholics in its Cabinet for two years and had the general consent, if not active support, of the Catholic body, was driven into acute antagonism to the Vatican. This, as in Italy, was the chief consequence of the Pope's act in 1949 in officially proclaiming to his Church that he refused to accept the conciliatory formula that Eastern, andp erhaps in time some Western, Governments required only support of their economic programme and would not interfere with creeds, as the Soviet Union had not done for twenty years. Only one thing now can save what is left of Catholicism in that half of the

earth that stretches from Central Europe to the China Sea: a successful war upon the East by America with the latest atomic bombs and poison sprays. Is the Pope of Peace working with the more callous American fire-eaters (the military men and certain financiers and industrialists) for that object? He clearly is.

CHAPTER IX

THE PERNICIOUS POLICY IN FRANCE

FEW people understand the condition of France from the religious point of view. Few, in fact, know the real condition in that respect of any country in the world. Ours is not an age that is sensitive to truth in its public instruction, but in no other field is there such callous indifference to reality as in the field of Catholic statements and statistics. To what sources would a member of the general public turn, for instance, in order to ascertain the numerical strength of the Church of Rome today? He would have to be very simple and confiding to consult the *Catholic Directory* and, not being sufficiently conceited to recommend my own works, I should find it difficult to indicate any reliable book to an inquirer.

American Catholics are, we shall see, dropping the word " Roman " from their style and title, as if they anticipated that in the near future the red flood of Communism and Socialism would engulf Italy and the Papal See would be transferred to Washington, the secular and the spiritual sovereignty of the world being once more happily blended. If you look up the article " The Catholic Church " in the *Encyclopædia Americana*, you will find forty pages on that institution. You learn that the world-total of membership of the Church " today " (1937) is 294,458,000. I may say that in the latest edition of the *Encyclopædia Britannica* it is given for the same year as 382,000,000—these clever priests juggle with millions more easily than you would with oranges—and 399,000,000 four years later; while the current issue of the *Catholic Directory* gives it as 423,000,000. How, in view of this beautiful growth, the Pope and the bishops come to distress us so frequently with laments of the materialism of the age and the success of the devil in propagating Communism it is not easy to understand.

Seriously, all these figures are preposterous. The *Americana* says that of the 294,000,000 no fewer than 183,760,000 are in Europe, and the details which make up this sum are reminiscent of Dr. Goebbels. Russia, which in 1937 had certainly not 1,000,000, if 250,000, Roman Catholics, is credited with 11,000,000. Spain, which had just disestablished its Church by a large majority in a free vote, is said to have about 20,000,000, whereas in the same year even the zealous Jesuit Father Gannett (*Irish Times*,

January 23) claimed only "ten or fifteen million." In Italy, where only the Fascists kept the Socialists and Communists out of power, there are supposed to have been 33,000,000 subjects of the Pope. For Germany, where the Catholics had never numbered 20,000,000, and in 1937 there were fewer than 10,000,000 dejected Romanists, we get the figure 24,000,000. But the French figure (35,000,000) is, perhaps, the most ridiculous. Three Catholic writers had dealt with the subject a few years earlier. André Goddard (*Le Surnaturel Contemporain*, 1922) describes his religion as almost dead in France; Georges Goyau (*L'Effort Catholique dans la France d'Aujourdhui*, 1922) makes a severe analysis, and leaves it open "whether there are in France today ten million practising Catholics as some say, or only five millions, as others say"; the Franco-American Denis Gwynn (*The Catholic Reaction in France*, 1924) follows Goyau, but considers the figure 10,000,000 very optimistic. And a new encyclopædia with unlimited resources tells America that the Catholics number 35,000,000 (in a total of 42,000,000), and our reference books still assure us, in spite of the formidable growth of Communism since 1937, that "the great majority of the French are Catholics"! The favourite epithet of Catholics for their creed is "the true religion."

I ought to relieve Catholic writers here of the suspicion of lying. It is merely deliberate deception. In the above quotations you notice the phrase "practising Catholics." The apologist may say that he claims only 7,000,000 or 8,000,000 practising Catholics and 27,000,000 non-practising Catholics, and that you cannot expect him to repeat this distinction every time he refers to numbers. I have explained in an earlier chapter the little trick by which the Catholic writer gets his big figures. "Once a Catholic always a Catholic," he says. His stern theology decides that Catholic baptism makes an indelible mark, and so it is nonsense for a man to say that he has left the Church. I am a Catholic—a rather bad one. Hitler and Goebbels were Catholics, and so on. The French way of expressing it is still funnier. These "non-practising Catholics" were taught, as is every Catholic child, that every time you fail to attend church on a Sunday morning you incur eternal punishment. So these 27,000,000 non-practising Catholics cheerfully incur the sentence of hell fifty-two times a year, with an extra dose at Easter for not going to confession. Will even the most refined person hesitate to say that the public are deliberately deceived when the Catholic authorities assure the compilers of our encyclopædias and annuals that their total number is 294,000,000, 399,000,000 or 423,000,000? The real figure is about 200,000,000, most of them children and illiterates.

After the 1914–18 war, and for the next ten years or so, there were about 7,000,000 or 8,000,000 Catholics in France out of a total population of 40,000,000. France had never been a Catholic country since 1880. During the Revolution the majority had abjured their faith, although Danton and Robespierre, whom our literature almost invariably represents as " robbing the nation of its faith," made every effort to keep the Church established. But nine writers out of ten who mention the Revolution today repeat lies, like the stupid legend of a prostitute on the altar of Notre Dame, that were exposed a century ago. However, the Church was restored by years of bitter persecution of its critics after the fall of Napoleon. It shrank again under the Second Empire, but it had an artificial flush of power and prosperity from 1870 to 1875, when the revolt of the Communists and the threat to finance had driven the middle class back to alliance with the Pope, just as the growth of Communism does today.

Since the early eighties of the last century the Republic has been completely secularized, and none of its Presidents or leading politicians, and very few of its chief writers or professors, have been Catholics. In my *Decay of the Church of Rome* (1909) I made a very careful estimate of the strength of the Church, mainly on Catholic evidence, and concluded that there were 5,500,000 Catholics in a total population of 39,000,000; and the distinguished Protestant writer M. Sabatier assured me that I had over-estimated the total by 1,000,000. But the annexation of Alsace-Lorraine in 1918 brought more than 1,000,000 Catholics into the French Church, and this accession of strength and other factors gave the Church, for the first time in forty years, an influence in the political world. Our Press was careful to avoid inquiries into the state of Alsace-Lorraine between the two wars, and allowed the public to accept without question the assurance of the French Government that the people of the " lost provinces " had returned with tears of joy to the motherland. On the contrary, they resented the rule of France and demanded autonomy.

They were in the great majority Catholics, and their bishops and clergy were naturally hostile to what the Vatican called the atheistic Government of France, especially when at first an attempt was made to extend to them the French law of the separation of Church and State and the secularization of the schools. The Vatican made its customary deal with the French Government—we check your rebels if you make concessions—and the body of deputies from Alsace-Lorraine in the Chambre became a weapon in the hands of the Cardinal Archbishop.

A marked change came over French political life. In 1904 I had seen a demonstration, patronized by the Government and the

municipality, of 100,000 Freethinkers in Paris. In 1924, when they held their next Congress, only about 300, half of them foreign delegates, attended. I asked Professor Buisson, who as Minister of Public Instruction had secularized the schools of France, what the change meant, and he talked vaguely about the Union Sacrée of all parties to defend the Republic. A mutual friend explained that at bottom it was the fear of losing Alsace-Lorraine. For the first time in sixty years France sent an ambassador to the Vatican and the Pope sent a Nuncio to Paris. The Radicals violently protested in the Chambre, and the clergy got the deputies for Alsace-Lorraine to threaten to secede. By one of those hypocritical pretences that always preceded a modern canonization—they are now political and financial moves—it was discovered, 500 years after her death, that Joan of Arc had worked miracles and she was declared a saint; and what the Vatican had for thirty years described as the atheistic Jews and Freemasons of the French administration went on their knees.

French policy was perverted in many ways. I was visiting a friend in our Legation at Athens in 1924 when the Greek Foreign Minister came in to tell our representative that the Turks had inflicted a tragic defeat on his country in Asia Minor with the aid of guns, tanks, and officers lent them by the French; though no British paper ever told this. A Yale professor of history whom I met later told me they had suspected this in America, but never definitely heard it. I had seen the Greek army in Adrianople a few days earlier ready to march on Constantinople. But the Pope did not want this. It would be too great an encouragement to the rival Greek Church if it got back its classical centre in Constantinople, and the heads of the French army were now Catholics.

This was, as it turned out, the worst consequence of the deal with the Vatican. Catholics like Pétain, Weygand, Darlan, Laval, Bonnet, Baudouin, Prouvost, etc., began to rise high in the army and the State. Britain confronted the great tragedy with a score of good planes and 1,000,000 gas-masks, but with a united and, when the truth was known, brave and resolute nation. France was in a shocking state of disunity and apathy, and its chief military commanders were traitors. In 1938 J. C. Maxence wrote of his country: "Like a man in deadly sickness, it neither moves nor speaks on the threshold of an agony" (*Histoire de Dix Ans*). The Royalists, all Catholics, had distracted the Government for years, and titled women in Nazi pay were busy among the politicians. One who had just arrived from Portugal in 1941 wrote this in the best London evening paper, *The Evening Standard*, November 4:—

A social layer has been imported, including many-lingual titled women whose morals are at the service of the Führer.

The treachery of Marshal Pétain became painfully known to the entire world in the course of the war, but our Press, in the usual fear of Catholics, never made plain that the chief ground of his treason to France was his loyalty to Rome. In 1942 a French work (*Pétain-Laval, the Conspiracy*) was translated into English and published in London. Lord Cecil wrote the introduction, and he vouched for the fact that the author was " a man of probity and honour with great knowledge of his subject." Marshal Pétain—followed at some distance by Generalissimo Weygand—was, he says, " a defeatist during the war of 1914–18, full of anti-British prejudice and jealous of Foch." He was very ambitious for power, a Catholic, " an enemy of the Republic." The rise to power of Hitler filled " the propertied classes " in France with enthusiasm. They would make a similar Dictator of Pétain, and he was more than willing.

France was honeycombed with a Catholic royalist conspiracy, partly financed from Rome and Berlin. Friendly with Goering and Mussolini, Pétain went as ambassador to Spain when Franco rose to power, and was very friendly with Hitler's ambassador through secret intermediaries. He was reported to the Government, but too many important soldiers and civilians were in the plot for them to depose Pétain. In March 1939 the German ambassador in Madrid actually told Pétain that the Germans would be in Paris in May 1940, and he did not report this to his Government but apparently told other high French officers, and in the spring of 1940 Paris hummed with talk of which the burden was :—

> France needs defeat. Defeat is necessary for her regeneration. Victory would strengthen the political regime which has brought her to moral ruin. Anything is preferable to the continuation of a regime so abominable. Defeat followed by a rapid peace will perhaps cost France a province, a few ports, some colonies. What are they in comparison with her imperative regeneration ?

In politics they worked through Laval, a papally-decorated man whom even Vichy rejected when it had got what it could through Weygand, who was in actual command of the army, Admiral Darlan, and the whole Catholic clique. When the decisive moment came Pétain, Weygand, and Laval said : " Surrender " ; as had said that other Catholic traitor, Albert, King of Belgium,

and the Catholic leaders in Austria and Czecho-Slovakia. The American journalist Shirer (*Berlin Diary*) started the canard, repeated in the British Press, that the French army was let down by the Communist soldiers. Any such traitors would have been shot at once, and, while there is no evidence of any, the real causes of the French failure in the field are generally recognized. But any reckless suggestion is welcomed to conceal the truth, which is that France was dragged into the mire because its leaders were determined to discredit the secular Government it had had since 1880 and to restore the power of the Church.

The traitors, except Laval, who had been the most active of all, but was personally detested by the others as a vulgar plebeian, gathered cheerfully at Vichy, and the sun of the Vatican shone upon them. Are we asked to believe that the Cardinal Archbishop knew nothing about this conspiracy in the interest of religion of the leading Catholics of Paris? Or that he failed to keep the Vatican informed? But it hardly needed this information. Even our *Annual Register* (1940) says that we know "from Vatican sources" that on March 11, 1940, Ribbentrop told the Pope that "German soldiers would be in Paris by June and in London by August." Naturally the Pope does not interfere in politics. He was just as eager as Pétain and Laval to see the fall of Paris. His daily paper, the *Osservatore Romano*, declared that what all good men and women in the world regarded as the most appalling and dishonouring calamity that France had ever suffered —a French professor of London University wept in Oxford Street when I spoke to him about it—was really "the dawn of a new and radiant day, not only for France but for Europe and the world." But surely, you will say, our British Catholics blushed for their French co-religionists. On July 12, just when we shudderingly awaited the German armada that would follow the Belgian and French treachery, our *Catholic Herald* said that "all that is vital in the soul of France, purified and glorified in heroic suffering, can look out once more upon Europe with a clear Christian purpose." The Catholic's conception of heroism is, like so many of his conceptions, peculiar. The only heroic folk left in France were the young men and women who loved and fought and died underground. Vichy stank in the world's nostrils.

Pétain inaugurated "the new and radiant day" by blotting out the last trace of the Revolution, the threefold ideal of Liberty, Equality, and Fraternity, and writing the new slogan for the workers: Work, Family, Obedience. No more talk of strikes for better conditions; no more of this beastly birth control that had relieved parents but starved churches in France for sixty years; no more of this disrespect for your pastors and masters. France

was to sink to the social level of Spain, Portugal, and Eire. But those wicked atheists of Russia and the non-Catholic Governments of Britain and America shattered the Pope's beautiful dream and hanged his friends, and he had to devise a new application of his policy.

Good Catholics would be well advised to take to heart the words of Browning, " Make no more giants, God, but elevate the race." They might respectfully submit to the Almighty that it is not so important that the Pope should be absolutely infallible when he talks about Immaculate Conceptions and Assumptions of the Virgin, but it would really help them if the Pope and his Cabinet had a larger measure of common human wisdom and principle in practical affairs. The new policy, we have seen, is a gamble. The world is split into two halves divided by an Iron Curtain. The Vatican believes, as many do, that sooner or later the America-dominated western half will destroy a few hundred million folk in the eastern half with hydrogen and uranium bombs, poison sprays, and other pious contrivances, then root out all Communism and Socialism in the western half and make the world safe for Private Enterprise—and religion. The Vatican will help in this sacred crusade by every means in its power; by intrigue in Russia-dominated lands, by using a political disguise for its voters in democratic countries, and by intensifying the invective against Communism and Socialism which it has used for a quarter of a century. It is a gamble in the sanctuary. For some of the gravest American authorities consider it at least possible that a tragic depression may paralyse America. Its parasites would then fall away or try to approach Russia, in which the Gosplan prevents depressions, the Socialists, and the Communists. . . . That is another story, but what would then be the reward of the Church of Rome for doing all in its power to bring about this horrible war or for remaining silent about the ethic of new military powers the use of which would have branded our age in history for all time?

The consequences of the new policy in France were the same as in Italy, where the political situation was much the same. To those who are not familiar with the conditions, the figures given at the numerous elections, as governments rise and fall—though, as the French say, the more they change the more they are the same thing —are bewildering. Our Press represents that the Catholics are not quite half the electors; and next day, probably, the same paper will tell you that the great majority of the French people are Catholics but they need alliances which are constantly changing in order to retain their power for a year or two. But the fact that no party in France calls itself Catholic or even Christian at once sug-

gests the truth to any thoughtful person. It is nonsense to say that the Church is so scrupulous to avoid politics that it never organizes Catholic voters as such. In Germany, which is reckoned a Protestant country, the Catholics were organized in the Centre Party and the Bavarian People's Party for sixty years. In "Catholic" France they would, if similarly organized, be a minority that would have little or no influence. But the Vatican realized that, as in 1875, when the rise of the Communards sent millions back into the clerical alliance, there were now again millions who would gladly vote for the Catholic leaders if they were spared the ignominy of wearing the Papal colours or marching under the Papal flag.

So the Popular Republican Movement put its invitation on the hoardings in plain bills with no mention of priests or holy water. With a new liberality the Church overlooked the heretical or irreligious opinions of those who joined with Catholics in this great anti-Communist and anti-Socialist organization, but, as the only coherent and well-organized body in the mixture, it took the lead and expected to provide the chief Ministers when it secured power. Royalist Catholics could not join a republican body and they had movements of their own, but the decay of the old Liberal and Radical bodies which had so long been the political backbone of France and both bitterly anti-clerical shows that very large numbers of these, the favourite chant of whose fathers had been "Down with the Skull-cap," had joined the democratic Catholics in the M.R.P. Against it were the great bodies of the Socialists and the Communists and a reduced body of Radicals; but the M.R.P. had the great advantage that these three divisions of the Left detested and fought each other.

In 1949 (March) the Departmental elections were held. For several reasons these do not indicate political or religious opinions so clearly. The local voters are apt to look to personalities rather than parties, and the system of counting votes is different. At the most the results show an increase in popularity of General de Gaulle and a considerable loss on the part of the Socialists and Communists. De Gaulle's party had split, but both parts, as well as the Independents, gained heavily. Keesing's *Archives* says that the Communist loss was largely due to "the electoral tactics of their opponents," even the Radicals (bitter anti-clericals) supporting the de Gaullists against the Communists. It admits that the election does not give a clear indication of the strength of the various parties, and that only one-half of the electorate used its vote. It might have added that besides the general irritation against the Communists for organizing strikes, there was a new grievance. A few weeks earlier the Communist

leader Thorez had said in public that if a Red Army invaded, the Communists would not fight against it. In any case, there are, contrary to the general belief, less than half as many members of the Communist Party in France as in Italy: less than in Czecho-Slovakia. Their strength is in their hold on the Trade Unions and the urban workers. Nothing in recent events suggests that the Church has recovered any ground. In the recent general election the Press acknowledged that the elections were rigged in favour of de Gaulle and the M.R.P.

It is the same in Belgium, as one would expect. When I studied oriental languages at Louvain University in 1893 and 1894 Catholics and Liberals alternated in power, and in the clerical circle in which I lived the name Liberal was much the same as spawn of the devil. Socialism advanced in the early part of this century, and, as the working class and the bourgeois parties detested each other, the Catholics, though a distinct minority, still occasionally secured power. After 1930 the Catholics lost ground heavily owing to scandals in the Church. Even the Catholic *Revue des Deux Mondes* (June 15, 1936) explained that the Church had " embarked upon sordid speculations " in order to " increase its strength and enrich some of its members." At the next election 73 Catholic deputies (besides 14 Flemish Nationalists and 4 Rexists, all Catholics) were returned against 102 anti-clericals (61 Socialists, 23 Liberals, 9 Radicals, and 9 Communists). Even in the Senate the Catholics had only 61 seats out of 150. Belgium was no longer a Catholic country, though our reference books continued to describe it as such.

The liberated country was less disposed than ever to listen to the priests. Their Catholic king had been guilty of grave treachery, and the Church had been on such good terms with the occupying Germans that the only parties they permitted to survive were the Flemish Nationalists and the Rexists (the Puritans of the Catholic body). Against the Pope and his betrayal of civilization they have an even more massive grievance. But, as in France and Italy, a more sacred cause than truth has increasingly laid a strain upon Belgian consciences. Donning the disguise of the Christian Social Party (which is absurd because there are few Protestants to join them), the Catholics have, as in France, Italy, etc., invited all sound men (all who hate Socialism and Communism) to fight with them and forget all about Voltaire and the Inquisition. " The Purse in Danger " is the new slogan. The result of the last election (January 1949) is therefore apt to mislead. The Christian Social Party (Catholics and those atheists who nobly sacrifice their convictions on the altar of material welfare) won 13 seats and hold 105 in the Chambre;

the anti-clericals (Socialists 66, Liberals 29 and Communists 11) hold 106. Even in the Senate, where the aroma of wealth is stronger, the Christian Socials hold only 54 seats to the anti-clerical 52. The result of the latest elections—a majority of 4 for the Catholics and their anti-Socialist allies—shows no material change. Less than half the country—and the less intelligent and smaller rustic Flemish half—is Catholic.

CHAPTER X

VATICAN POLICY IN THE FAR EAST

In an earlier chapter I spoke about the Eastern Policy which, according to all observers of Papal developments, the Vatican adopted early in the present century. It had seen materialism and anti-clericalism spread alarmingly in Italy, France, and Spain—the only countries of which it had a fair knowledge—and understood that these fruits of the modern spirit and modern science were even worse in the countries of their origin—Germany, Britain, and America. The West gave less and less hope of that recovery of its ancient power of which the Vatican has not ceased to dream. It concluded that labour in the " mystic " east, which would never accept materialism, would be more profitable. The myth of the " wisdom " and international news-service of the Vatican dies hard. But in an age when nearly every Briton was repeating that " East is East and West is West and never the twain shall meet," that India and China were quite impervious to modern thought, we need not be surprised that the mandarins at the Vatican did not realize how materialistic and superficial even religion is in the greater part of Asia, or that Japan, which had avidly absorbed Western culture, was just as Asiatic as China.

This vague Eastern Policy assumed a scientific form after the fall of the Tsars. The Church would now have two strategical bases for its advance over Asia—Russia and Japan. Its conception of each was, as usual, crude. The Bolshevik leaders naturally hated the Orthodox Church, which had been for a century in the closest alliance with their brutal persecutors, and they proposed to rely on education to remove religion from the minds of their people. Lenin therefore casually replied to Roman inquiries that religion was now free in Russia, and the Vatican dreamed of taking over the vast domains of the Orthodox Church. This differed very little—what did the millions know about the Procession of the Holy Ghost which so profoundly stirred the theologians—except in its head, and you could almost say that the old head had been cut off. The Pope would just slip into its place, and there were 100,000,000 converts ready made. But, as I showed, the invasion war soon gave a political turn to religion, and, when the last Jesuit was expelled for persistent intrigue in 1924, that part of the dream faded and the Pope helped to construct the Iron Curtain.

The Japanese leaders, on the other hand, though sceptics almost to a man themselves, wanted to keep the people religious. In 1871, when the Americans had, with the aid of a few warships, introduced the blessings of Christian and scientific civilization to the Japanese, they sent a number of scholars and officials to Europe to study the social effectiveness of Christianity and report whether or no it was advisable to import this with the rifles and cotton-spinning machines. They decided, with ideal impartiality—for they were all agnostics or atheists—that Buddhism and Shinto were more suitable for national purposes, but they gave complete liberty to the Pope to send his missionaries. When the test came their judgment was fully vindicated. The disbanding of the Samurai—the rather brutal hereditary soldiers of older Japan—poisoned the national life, and the Black Dragon Society, which spread in the higher ranks of the army, navy, and political world, worked out the theory that their very superior race ought to take over all Eastern Asia and the islands. The ease with which they dictated to China encouraged them. They permitted China to take the side of the Allies in the 1914–18 war, and at the close of the war they demanded and got the German territory in China and the islands as a reward for their virtue in refusing to support Germany in the war. Besides the more or less secret Black Dragon Society, they now had a number of popular patriotic societies which, under one title or other, inoculated the entire nation with the creed that they were the salt of the earth and were summoned by the gods, of whom the Emperor was a literal descendant, to take over at least the whole of Eastern Asia, if not also India and the entire south. They bought up the Buddhist and Shinto priests, and these religions now fully justified the decision of 1871 that they should be retained as the national creeds.

As each chapter of this work is not only a study of a special aspect of the development of Papal policy in our time but a contribution to the general history of our progress towards chaos—I feel sure that the reader will find much here that was generally suppressed at the time and is still buried—I would say a further word on these Japanese events, although we have not yet reached the intimate contact with the Papacy.

It is now well known that the plan to absorb China goes back to the early days of the century, but very few know that both in Britain and America we had weighty warnings of the growth of the plot. In 1933 Professor O'Conroy, who had taught for years in Japan and, being married to a Japanese lady of good family, was thoroughly informed, warned us in his *Menace of Japan* that the middle class and rich men of Japan, whom he described as

very corrupt, all shared the aggressive plan. He showed also, largely relying on an investigation by a Japanese paper, that the Buddhist monks were as corrupt as the German monks proved to be a few years later. Japanese journalists raided a famous Buddhist monastery near Tokio in 1928, and this is part of what they found (p. 88) :—

> Women were chained up naked in the very temple, and the priests appear to have acted like sadistic monsters. Rape, sexual mutilation, and ignominy were but a few of the foul performances that took place. Degradation of the foulest kind, things impossible to describe, were everyday occurrences in the holy place. When the raid took place figures of mangled demented women were found huddled in some corners, while their keepers squabbled over a gambling game and played for paper money with cards stained with blood. The monks appear to have been excreting upon a heap of helpless women. Many were dead and had been dead for some time, and their bodies rotting and putrified.

Yet even some of our humanist writers continued to represent Buddhist and Catholic monasticism as one of the finer flowers of the religious garden and to recommend the works of myopic Lafcadio Hearn and the hireling Professor Nitobe.

At the International Congress of Religions held in the University of Chicago in 1934 all this was confirmed, one of the professors quoting the admission of Baron Kato, head of Tokio University, that " our priests are corrupt." Both Buddhist and Shinto priests, the professors said, had been heavily bribed by the Government and the wealthy to preach the Pan-Japanese ideal to the people, and even the sincerely religious few worked wholeheartedly for it, all along Southern Asia as far as Turkey, preparing the way for the troops. In the same year a work (*Challenge*) by a well-known American journalist, who wrote under the pen-name of Upton Close, gave the American public a mass of evidence on both points from Japanese literature and Press. He showed that in 1933 the big stores of Tokio set up in their basements highly-coloured panoramas of the destruction of the American fleet by the Japanese, and millions of the Japs gloated over them. Yet in 1937, when the Americans published a great new *Encyclopædia Americana*, to replace the *Britannica*, of its twenty-five articles on Japan, twenty were by Japanese propagandists, telling of their love of peace and America, and the others were by complaisant missionaries. And this was practically the only source of information on Japan available to the American public until the awful echo of Pearl Harbour stunned them. We

have grand means of disseminating knowledge, or at least statements, in our time.

It is significant to record that the alliance of the Vatican and Japan began in 1931, when the Black Dragon first spat its poison on Asiatic soil and inaugurated the series of Fascist crimes by seizing Manchuria. We rightly blame the Powers for allowing trade considerations to restrain them from denouncing and punishing this outrage, but, while they at least hesitated, the Vatican entered into friendly negotiations with the bandits. A Catholic (plainly clerical) article in the *Revue des Deux Mondes* (January 15, 1935), at one time a fine French literary magazine which passed under Church control, said :—

> A short time after it had given birth to the new state of Manchukuo the Japanese Government advised its ward to turn to the Holy See with a request that it should be officially recognized.

So, it adds, the Vatican " appointed a French Vicar Apostolic to negotiate with the Government of Manchukuo about religious affairs " (p. 29). Observe the very polite description of an outrage that angered the world as " giving birth " to a government and treating it as a ward. But the French Catholic writers London and Pichon are more candid in their *Vatican et la Monde Moderne*. They say that it was the French—we saw how they had passed under Church influence—who secretly suggested this step to the Japanese Government while they openly joined in the chorus of indignation at its act. The fact was reported in a few British papers, and the Catholic reply was that the Pope would have been faithless to his duty if he had not sent these priests to look after the souls of the Manchurians. The plain truth is that the Black Pope, like the Black Dragon, thus got his first footing in China. The Asiatic policy was growing bright again.

All this spiritual sophistication turns sour when you continue to read the story. Encouraged by the impotence of Europe and America, each fearing that the other would gain an advantage in trade or in the partition of China, the Japanese proceeded to annex the northern provinces of China, while Chiang Kai-Shek was encouraged by America and Britain to employ all his forces in destroying the Communists. I must assume that the reader knows the true nature of the " co-prosperity " that Japan was introducing into these Chinese provinces. On November 3, 1934, the *Catholic Times* ingenuously invited its readers and as many other British folk as it would reach—which, fortunately, is not many—to admire the Japanese who " have brought freedom from

persecution [which is a lie] to our missionaries in Manchuria" and adjacent parts of China, and—note well the ramifications of the Vatican policy—have "consented to their settlers in Brazil being instructed in the Catholic faith." A few months later the Papal *Osservatore* chanted the same song, and announced that the Vatican and Tokio were arranging to exchange ambassadors (as they later did).

All over the world the Catholic Press—I saw it repeatedly in the American Catholic papers—was defending and praising Japan while the informed part of civilization was outraged by its aggressions and brutality. It had now overrun the northern provinces of China as well as Manchuria, and its troops, encouraged by their officers, displayed all the barbarity and sadism for which they would later become notorious throughout the world. The soldiers raped all females from the age of twelve to seventy and plundered even the poorest homes, while the officials deliberately debauched the conquered population with opium and gambling. Read the appalling work of H. J. Timperley (a sober correspondent of the *Manchester Guardian*), *What War Means* (1938).

Even if the Vatican, whose missionaries trod on the heels of the sordid "conquerors" everywhere, pretended that it knew nothing of their debauchery, it was very plainly guilty of encouraging the first steps in that unscrupulous conquest of the earth which the Japanese, the Nazis, and the Fascists contemplated. By 1934, when the co-operation of the Vatican was most openly announced, the aggressive programme of the three criminal powers was completely known in Japan, Germany, and Italy. I have more belief than most people in the ignorance or obtuseness of the Papal headquarters, but it is impossible to doubt that Cardinal Secretary of State Pacelli, with representatives in every country, was unaware of their programme, yet he used the full international resources of his Church to protect Japan from the world-anger with which its brutal progress over China was followed; and the more blatant the Japs became the more cordial were their relations with the Vatican.

These special relations began, we saw, when the Pope (or his Cardinal Secretary of State) sent a French prelate to collaborate with the Japanese who had occupied Manchuria in 1931. To say that these Japs were concerned about the spiritual welfare of the few Christians in Manchuria while they callously debauched the whole population is just typical of the kind of thing that is said in these matters. It is just as nauseating to read that the Japanese authorities give the Vatican permission to take care of the souls of Japanese pedlars in Brazil. There were at the time

vast areas of Brazil in which there was only one priest to 100,000 Indians (Braga and Grubb, *The Republic of Brazil*, 1932). They were so poor that their " spiritual interests " did not concern the hierarchy. An American Catholic wrote a work calling for 40,000 priests to take up the neglected Indians of Brazil. They insult our intelligence when they suggest that while the Vatican would not stir a finger to help these millions of Brazilians, it entered into a compact with the Japanese Government for an option on a few tens of thousands of yellow souls.

That Rome was, as usual, ignoring every common human social principle in its own interest, because it saw, it thought, a glorious prospect of bringing China under the Pope, it is hardly possible to doubt. For, instead of withdrawing from the alliance when Japan went on to plunder further provinces, its cordiality increased with the violence of the outrages committed by the Japanese soldiers.

In 1935 the *Osservatore* announced that Japan and the Vatican were to exchange ambassadors, and the Catholic writer in the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, which I quoted, said, as if it were a matter in which French Catholics might take pride, that the French mission were, in fact, specially rewarded by the Japs for their share in the alliance, and that the relations between Rome and Tokio were now so friendly that " no Japanese prince or mission now passes through Rome without paying its homage to the Sovereign Pontiff." In Britain and America the alliance was not vaunted so publicly, and when, on October 20, 1937, the influential American journalist Pegler stated the facts in his syndicated column, he was fiercely attacked by Catholics. He then disclosed that he had bought the news from clerical officials in the Vatican's publicity bureau; one, he said, of the most venal organizations of the kind in Europe. On December 26, 1940, Baron Matsuoka, the vilest of Japan's international agents, said in the Diet that Japan (seeing the prostration of the West) intended to " dominate the mainland and occupy a preferential position in Indo-China and the Dutch Indies." A month or two later Matsuoka joined Hitler and Mussolini in Berlin, to complete the great plot in the light of Hitler's victories, and from this Witches' Sabbath he went to see the Pope. They had, the *Osservatore* said, a most cordial interview, and the Pope gave the wicked baron a special gold medal! It is all in Keesing. What had Matsuoka told the Pope? No one will ever know, but I understand that at their final conference the Nazis and the Japs agreed to divide the Old World between them—it was always intended to double-cross Mussolini—Hitler taking over Soviet territory as far as Lake Baikal, and the Japanese all Eastern and

Southern Asia and all islands of the Indian Ocean and the Pacific. The Pope was more friendly than ever.

China has engaged our attention so far only in the sense that the Papacy dreamed of subjugating it spiritually while the Japanese ruled it politically and exploited it economically. For this weakness of the great Asiatic giant the Catholics have no more responsibility than other missionaries, and these might plead that they were no more to blame than the secular powers. When Sun Yat Sen began at last the unselfish and mighty task of unifying and building up the strength of China, he used Chiang Kai-Shek as one of the very few Chinese who knew anything about modern warfare. It is part of the myth that protects what are called Western interests that Chiang is a distinguished general and Chinese scholar and a Christian statesman. This is all nonsense. The Communists made the masterly retreat to the northwest which Snow describes in *Red Star Over China*, and, during the years when the Japanese were brutally spreading from the North, Chiang used his forces in futile conflicts with the Communists, and in Shanghai. But the appalling corruption of his administration is notorious, and is now admitted even by those who until a few years ago described the Communists as bandits.

This condensed information—in America I have published a substantial biography of Chiang Kai-Shek as well as of Hitler, Roosevelt, Stalin, and Churchill—may help the reader to understand how the Papal card-castle in China collapsed so speedily and completely when the Japanese were beaten. The Roman missionaries will find the Chinese, in spite of the Pope's scandalous twelve-year alliance with Japan, as tolerant as ever, for, as Mr. Chi-Hsien Chung says in the *Chinese Year-Book*, " the number of bona-fide Buddhists, Taoists, Christians, and Confucianists has been and is comparatively small." They absorbed the atheism which the Communists brought far more easily and deeply than they adopted any form of mysticism that was ever offered them. And from China the Red culture is prevented from flowing down to the shore of the Indian Ocean and the islands beyond only by the Americans, French, Dutch, and British. What the outcome of that struggle may be we cannot speculate here. It is enough that Rome's Oriental Policy, with strategical bases in Russia at one end and China at the other, is in ruins.

What is likely to happen to the Church in Japan is also so intimately bound up with political developments that no attempt can be made here to answer the question. At present the Vatican holds its ground through the powerful influence which the Church in America has on Washington, and General MacArthur's perverse policy before he was dismissed from office. At the first elec-

tions, in April 1946, the Liberals led with 139 seats to the Social Democrats 92. A new Constitution was drafted, and in the new elections the Social Democrats headed the poll with 143 seats; the Liberals got 133, the Democrats 126, the Communists 4. But these names have hardly even the political meaning they have in Europe, and throw no light on the issue we are discussing here. America is in a dilemma. By hook or crook it wants to retain Japan as a base for operations against China and the Soviet Union, yet it sees that if Japan is to return to strength and prosperity it can hardly do so without permitting a return of the old steep contrast—the steepest in the world—of wealth and poverty and a new and disastrous flooding of the world with cheap goods. One thing seems clear: religion can never recover the position that it had in pre-war Japan and, when the golden voice of America is heard no longer in its councils, the Pope's ambition will be severely checked.

CHAPTER XI

THE POLES UNDER THE VATICAN

WHEN, in the latter part of 1936, I wrote the outline forecast of the war which was published in the following year in my *History of Europe since 1918*, I made one important miscalculation. I predicted that Poland would join Hitler in his offensive against the Soviet Union. Hatred of Russia had roots that were more than a century deep in the mind of Poland, and only at the expense of Russia could the proud nobility of Poland ever hope to regain the prosperous empire of which they never ceased to dream. Moreover, the Vatican was in alliance with Germany and was elated at least by its destruction of Socialism and Communism, while it spat venom on the Soviet Union every month or so; and Poland was the most Catholic State in Europe. But it transpired that the decision was not left to Poland. Hitler concluded that the domination of Poland was essential to his plan and, springing a quarrel with it over Dantzig and the Corridor, he opened his campaign there. Every German was now reminded by what trickery and fraud the Poles had, with the connivance of Versailles and the League, got German cities under their control.

It was the culmination of more than a century and a half of suffering, since the first Partition of Poland in 1772. Like the Jews, the Poles wondered generation after generation, when they would, for their fidelity to the Lord, be liberated from the oppressor and rewarded with national prosperity. Indeed, if Catholics demanded realism instead of "spiritual" assurances from their apologists, they would have asked why just those peoples of Europe which were most loyal to the faith that was supposed to afford the finest social inspiration as well as the surest pass to heaven, had fallen from their high estate and become the hewers of wood and drawers of water for the heretical peoples; why Poland, Ireland, Spain, and Portugal remained at the lowest level of literacy and social efficiency. In 1918 they seemed to hear at last the trump of the liberating angel; but the angel blundered, as angels so often do. My friend, Professor Shotwell, who was on President Wilson's staff, told me how, when it came to settling such boundaries as those of Poland, Clemenceau and Paderewski paralysed the poor idealist with names of cities and provinces which sounded to him like a Morse

alphabet in sneezes and induced him to consent to flagrant violations of his own fourteen points. ("My God," said the wicked Clemenceau, "the Almighty himself had only ten.") In the new republic of Poland, with its population of 30,000,000, there were 8,000,000 Russians (White Russia and the Galician Ukraine) and 1,000,000 German Protestants. And when the Allies invaded and further weakened Russia, the Poles swarmed over the devastated land and proposed to annex a good deal more of it.

There are points here that one must understand if one would understand the Poland of today and its extraordinarily smooth transition from a land of quite exceptional loyalty to Rome to a land that, certainly in the great majority of its people, we shall see, honours what is to the Vatican the very sign-manual of the devil in politics—the Hammer and Sickle. People who fancy that the Poles must bemoan the democracy and freedom of which they have been "deprived" do not know their history. They have known a sort of democracy only for a few years. The two great men of Poland in 1918, the fine artist Paderewski and the ruthless soldier Pilsudski, detested each other, but collaborated politely in the restoration of their country. Soon, naturally, there was only one great man in politics, the soldier, and he made as clumsy a statesman as soldiers nearly always do. The politicians who joyously found employment in the new Government distrusted him, and for a few years the Poles had an uneasy and incompetent democracy, a minority of Socialists fiercely opposing the feudalist Catholic ruling caste. Pilsudski was suspected of leaning to both Socialism and anti-clericalism, and when, in 1926, he moved at last into Warsaw with his troops, the powerful Conservatives and bishops would have beaten him if the workers had not saved him by a general strike. He became Premier or semi-Dictator, but in 1929 he openly emulated Mussolini, booting out the politicians. The Socialist deputies were thrown into jail for resisting his dictatorship and treated with barbarity. Not only were they brutally flogged and half-starved, but the soldiers who guarded them were encouraged to perpetrate all the horrors that would in a later year characterize the Nazi concentration camps. These facts were stated in the Sejm. How many of us know that for ten years before the German invasion this was the kind of democracy that the Poles "enjoyed"?

What more properly concerns us here, because the Vatican is implicated, is that during the whole twenty years between the wars the Church directed a religious persecution of non-Romanist citizens of the Republic of the most bitter and virulent description.

There is no need to tell here how the Holy Synod had co-operated with the Tsarist Government in persecuting the Polish Catholics during the nineteenth century. The revolting account given in the *Catholic Encyclopædia* is substantially correct. But there were only two papers in England—the *Manchester Guardian* and the *New Statesman*—that ever noticed the persecution of the Greek Catholics by the Polish Roman Catholics, and even these did not convey that the persecution had begun as soon as the blunderers of Versailles had entrusted the Poles—exacting, of course, a solemn promise that they would respect the rights of minorities—with the control of millions of men and women of alien race and religion.

Clemenceau, the finest and most humane statesman at Versailles, was too old to attack the heavy problems of that Conference, and was, indeed, obsessed with the fear of a German war of revenge. Within a year of his constructing the flimsy and unjust fabric of the new Poland he received a copy of a pamphlet (*Les Atrocités Polonaises en Galicie Ukrainienne*, 1919) that had been published by two distinguished Ukrainians, V. Tennytski and J. Bouratch. It told him that the Poles had at once entered upon a course of both racial and religious persecution. Already 1,000 Orthodox priests had been arrested. In one overcrowded and filthy jail, at Lemberg, there were 200 priests of the Greek rite among 2,000 political prisoners, and the soldiers were instructed to deal most harshly with these prisoners. Women in the villages were beaten and raped, men were shot by the thousand, and "whole villages were depopulated by massacre." The pamphlet, a copy of which I read in the British Museum Library, was not translated into any language. It was buried and forgotten, and it was ten years, during which the persecution continued to seethe, before attention was again drawn to the savagery.

Then, as I said, the *Manchester Guardian* gave the facts, and the *New Statesman* commented on them; and in America the Chicago *Daily News* and the *Herald-Tribune* boldly told the story. In France a Catholic writer, René Martel, exposed the grisly truth in his *La France et la Pologne*. This writer also gave the story of the callous fraud that had been perpetrated by the authorities in 1918. The Poles claimed prosperous parts of Silesia to which, on the basis of Nationalism, they had no right. A plebiscite was ordered by Versailles, but it was conducted with cynical fraud, and as a result the Poles got several large towns (in which, in spite of the crookedness, the citizens had voted for Germany by a large majority) and five-sixths of the Silesian mines. In spite of this, the greedy ruling class in Poland left the mass of the workers in sordid poverty, and did not, in fact, make a great wealth for the country.

A French Catholic writer in the *Revue des Deux Mondes* (February 1, 1933) gave a glowing account of the unparalleled piety of the Poles and added that "nearly all the Poles are ruined." The condition of the workers is described by Spivak in *Europe Under the Terror.* They were poorer and more miserable than the Portuguese. And the dictatorship of Pilsudski made the economic situation worse. In 1927–28 the national revenue was 2,655 million zlotys; in 1934–35 it was 2,114 millions, and the national debt had risen five-fold. Yet when the Marshal died in 1935 the Press said nothing about his incompetence and his brutal persecutions but decorated his memory with fragrant garlands. Millions of the workers were then receiving one shilling per day of eighteen working hours. But the Vatican boasted that in proportion to population Poland sent it a larger sum in Peter's Pence than any other country, a fact that may not be without bearing on its white-hot zeal for America to deliver Poland from its present Communist Government.

The best source of information, and one which should prevent any editor or journalist from pleading ignorance, is a large book that was published in America in 1931 by the Ukrainian refugees, under the editorship of Emil Revyuk. It is a solid compilation of documents from such numerous and diverse sources, including the few British and American papers that had told the truth, that the facts cannot be challenged. The aim of the persecution was to crush all alien people who had been forcibly brought into the new republic and force them to surrender their own tongue, religion, and customs. The Catholic bishop of Posen was one of the directors of the commission set up for the purpose, and the work began while the late Pope, Pius XI, was resident in Poland as Nuncio. Even in the memorial submitted to Clemenceau we read such details as: "Most of the Greek Churches are plundered by Polish soldiers and used as stables for their horses and even as latrines" (p. 25). A particularly vicious attack was made on the religion of the Russians and Ukrainians, since it was chiefly to this that the ignorant people clung; though the Ukrainian cities had reached a higher degree of culture than was generally believed, and there were many lawyers, professors, church dignitaries, and doctors among the victims.

By 1930 there were 200,000 political prisoners in the Polish-Ukrainian jails; and when this was reported by the accredited correspondent of the *Herald-Tribune*, the second most important paper in America, the representatives of Poland in Washington said, and at least American Catholics generally accepted their stupid assurance, that this was a misprint for 200. On March 18, 1923, the troops fell with rifle and sabre upon an immense

crowd of people holding a peaceful demonstration in front of their cathedral at Leopol. Elliott, of the *Herald-Tribune*, said :—

> In the Ukrainian villages of the district priests and peasants have been brutally flogged with the knout (a bunch of leather thongs specially hardened and twisted with wire) and women shamefully mishandled.

The correspondent of the *Manchester Guardian*—some of these correspondents were themselves vilely treated for sending home a little of the truth—revealed that in the jails even boys were atrociously tortured—see articles on October 11, November 18 and 22, December 29, 1930, and January 28 and 30, 1931. Priests, women, and boys were publicly flogged in the villages until they cried "Long Live Pilsudski." Orthodox priests were beaten with the butts of rifles and set to the filthiest tasks in the village. Pregnant women and young girls were flogged. The soles of their feet were burned with hot irons. Water was forced down their nostrils. They were prevented from sleeping for days. Priests were scalded with boiling milk or bayoneted or knouted until many were driven mad. The Polish writer and senator, A. Strug, denounced the atrocities in the Sejm, and the Secretary of the Women's International League, Miss Sheepshanks, was sent to investigate. At least 500, possibly 800, villages, she reported, were destroyed by soldiers, often with artillery which the authorities sent for the purpose. Nearly 3,000 schools were closed or appropriated by the Roman Catholics. Hundreds of Co-operative Societies were ruined and thousands of farmers dispossessed. Priests were murdered. Young girls were raped. Youths from Roman Catholic colleges were sent out to destroy property and insult Ukrainian Orthodox girls. Other details were added by the *Chicago Daily News* and the Toronto *Evening Telegram*; and the long chapters of outrages described in Revyuk's book "surpass the suffering of Calvary," a priest said. There is no case, except some instances in the late war, in which the foulest atrocities were so indisputably established as here.

Over an area as large as Ireland this squalid persecution, mainly on the ground of religion, was maintained for nearly twenty years. It merely relented a little when Pilsudski died in 1935. And to the mind of the reader who does not like to have atrocities recalled, however solidly the truth may be established, I submit this painful fact: all this, which the Catholic Church denied from Rome to Washington—everywhere except in Poland—proceeded just while the Pope and his Church were embittering the world with false statements that the Soviet Union was perse-

cuting religion. Our Moscow ambassador reported, and our Home Secretary read the report in the House of Commons, as I told, that there never was any persecution of religion as such—in plain English, never was any persecution of religion—in Russia.

And during all the time that Rome poured out these poisonous lies—from 1924 to 1937—the Church in Poland was egging on the authorities to commit the foulest outrages, in the name of religion as much as in the name of national unity. The Pope had, we saw, sent out all over the Catholic world the most violent assurance of atrocities in Spain when, as was proved, there were no atrocities on the Republican side; and he must have known that his Polish clergy were then deeply involved in far greater outrages. His sensitiveness to cruelty is peculiar. Not a word about the twenty years of atrocities in Poland. Not a word about the ghastly treatment of the Abyssinians by Mussolini's troops. Not a word about the butchery of Jews and Communists by the Nazis in 1933. Not a word about the outrages under Franco in Spain, under Salazar in Portugal, under Vargas in Brazil. Not a word about the horrors of the concentration camps and of German conduct in the conquered countries (including Poland). Only when, in 1939, Russia blocked the way of the Germans in Poland and took back its old provinces (Byelorussia, and the Ukraine), his sensitiveness to suffering awoke and he again made a false charge of persecution against the Soviet Union; as if it were even plausible that it would commit atrocities in two Russian provinces that it was welcoming back into the Motherland.

We must suppose that for a year or two the Pope's courtship of Lenin and the Bolsheviks was interrupted. Poles swept on when Britain, France, and the other allies of the White Russians withdrew, and everywhere the Catholic clergy greeted and helped them. Certainly some of them were executed for treason when the Russians, rallying in the same kind of upsurge that they would show again in 1943, drove Pilsudski's large and well-organized army back to the gates of Warsaw. But what the Pope had said about their invasion of Russia—it must have seemed to the Vatican to offer a splendid prospect of replacing the Holy Synod—and what the Poles felt when he began immediately to coquet with the Bolshevik leaders, as I told, history knoweth not. Perhaps you do not need documentary evidence.

Nor have we any documentary evidence on the very interesting question what the Pope thought of the invasion of Poland by his new and picturesque friend in Berlin. Apostate from the faith, murderer from the day on which he got power in his hands, liar and perjurer even in regard to his conflicts with Rome, the

grimmest exposer of clerical vice in modern history, Hitler, nevertheless, was never more closely associated with the Pope than he was in 1939, when he opened the war, and in 1940, when he planned his savage raid upon Western Europe. That fact at least is known history. The Pope's English biographer and adoring admirer, Rankin, shows it. From virtual ruler of the Church, or Secretary of State, Cardinal Pacelli became actual ruler or Pope—elected, Cardinal Hinsley tells us, expressly because he was an apostle of peace—on March 12, 1939. A few days later his chief representative in Slovakia, Mgr. Tiszo, went to Berlin to ask Hitler to take over the whole of Czecho-Slovakia, and a week or two later Mussolini invaded Albania. On April 24, Rankin says, the Pope received a very secret letter from the Nuncio in Berlin—so confidential that none of the cardinals except the Secretary of State was allowed to see it—and, after brooding over it for two days, he wrote the reply with his own hand. In May and June there was, Rankin says, " feverish activity " at the Vatican. There were frequent visits of the ambassadors, and there was a brisk secret correspondence with the Papal Nuncios at Berlin, Paris, and Warsaw. What was it all about? No documents. But since, from the moment of the fall of Czecho-Slovakia, Britain was strenuously preparing for war, and Hitler's quarrel with Poland over Dantzig and the Corridor was the outstanding topic of the world, it is difficult to believe that the subject of these unusual Vatican negotiations was the price of cotton or the progress of television.

At least, say Catholics, the Pope sternly condemned the outrages that the Germans committed in Poland. These were so notorious that the moral ruler of the world could hardly be silent in spite of that remarkable faculty of self-restraint of which he had given so many proofs. On January 22, 1940, he, in the course of a broadcast address, spoke with disapproval of " infamy of all kinds " and horrible and inexcusable excesses in Poland. But, as I have previously explained, when the Germans brazenly asked if he could possibly refer to them, he feebly replied that he understood that the outrages " were not confined to the districts under Russian occupation." It was monstrous enough to put in a common category the infamy of the Germans, which the world-Press reported, and any retaliation which Russian soldiers, conscious of the twenty years of Polish persecution of their countrymen, may have committed. But even the vague stories of these were lies. Stephen Graham, a very conscientious Protestant and an authority on Eastern Europe, quoted the Pope's speech in his *Stephen Graham's News Letter* and added, on the authority of an English eye-witness :—

> The fear (of Russian outrages) proved to be groundless. The discipline is extremely severe, and cases are known when soldiers were shot by the political commissars for the slightest breach of discipline.

It confirms the complaint of blind prejudice against Russia to find Graham adding the extraordinary explanation that doubtless the atheist soldiers of 1918 were now Christians. The political commissars to whom he ascribes this decent conduct certainly were not. Apart from this, however, the soldiers of 1918 were, according to all authorities, still overwhelmingly Christian, and the soldiers of 1939 were in the great majority not; and I have already shown that the revolution which these soldiers of 1918 carried was " one of the most bloodless on record."

I doubtless seem so far to have written with some prejudice against Poland. I confess that I detested the pre-war ruling class, in Church and State, and excused the very obvious defects of the mass of the people on the ground that they were kept in ignorance and shamefully exploited. Too many folk who think that they judge such matters without either religious or anti-religious prejudice are persuaded by their fine sentiments to dispense with critical inquiry into facts. Poland, they say, was so very religious that the general character *must* have been admirable. It is one of the worst fallacies in current literature. There is this excuse for these people that if they sought a book by some competent sociologist or criminologist on the factual relation of crime and religion, particularly Catholic religion, they would not find one in English (or French, German, or Italian). I have made considerable inquiry into the real relation of statistics of crime to Catholic education, and quite understand why sociologists shrink from what one would think an urgent requirement of our age.

Of the state of religion in pre-war Poland we have full assurance. It was one of the most, if not the most, Catholic countries in Europe. Yet when I came to analyse its criminal statistics during the ten years before the war, when it had had ample time to recover from Tsarist mismanagement, I was astounded. It had, with a smaller population, three to four times as many prisoners in jail as England and Wales. It had immensely more crime and delinquency and far more juvenile delinquents. And both juvenile delinquents and the inmates of the prisons increased by 25 per cent in the four years that immediately preceded the war.

I may say that it was much the same in Eire, and, as far as the miserable statistics allow us to judge, in Spain and Portugal, but I will confine myself to a few words on the special point of sex offences, which are particularly supposed to be checked by

Catholic education and services. This is, in fact, totally untrue. Both in Poland and Eire such offences were worse than in England, just as they are worse in Catholic Liverpool and Glasgow than in London. How any man who travels at all can imagine otherwise it is not easy to understand. I have walked through a village in Capri with a benevolent medical man who stopped to talk to the peasants at their doors and heard him advise a mother, who laughed, to give her anæmic daughter (who stood by) a lover. I have stood on the Capitol at Rome with an American official who had a dozen years' intimate knowledge of Italy while he pointed out the house in which one of the leading cardinals kept his mistress and children, and boys of twelve or thirteen solicited us in broad daylight. I have walked along a street in Mexico City where a prostitute sat sedately in the sun at every door and courteously stated her trade, as if she were a maid selling embroidery. I have entered the hall of blocks of flats in one of the chief streets of Buda Pesth where there was a nude photograph of every lady in the flats above; and I have seen such ladies as thick and communicative in the Prater-Strasse at Vienna as beggars in Spain. Some allow Catholics to persuade them to brush these things aside with a reminder of " the hot blood of the south "—a stupid expression—but it was nearly as bad in frozen Poland, and far worse in pre-revolution Moscow and Petrograd.

To return to our story. One might suppose that it would have embarrassed every thoughtful Catholic, at least in Britain and America, to see that the Pope's closest friends among the statesmen of the world in the terrible crisis of 1941 were Hitler, Mussolini, Matsuoka, Pétain, Laval, Franco, Salazar, etc. We do not, in fact, find that many Catholics were embarrassed. Popular Catholic journalism is a fearful and wonderful thing. But when the tide of war turned, the Pope discovered the naughtiness of those statesmen, who were doomed, and began to reorganize his shattered Church in Poland. Even in this land, which had so recently been one of the brightest jewels in his triple crown, he could not present a Catholic Party in the political field. Their banner was to have the innocent device " The Peasant's Party," and in the latter part of 1946 they girded themselves for the fray.

I have described how little democracy or freedom there had been in Poland for at least ten years before the war. Picking my way carefully among conflicting opinions, I should say that there was now, in the new association with the Soviet Union, far more. The leaders of the Peasants' Party complained that 230 of their candidates for the Sejm had been rejected by the Communist-Socialist Government (which had already sent back the old Concordat to the Vatican), and that 12,000 members of the party

were in prison. The Government replied that only 200,000 names had been struck off the Register for collaboration with the Germans or new conspiracy, and that there were only 2,110 members of the Peasant's Party in prison; while 35 election commissioners, 527 Security Police, and 250 ordinary police had been murdered. The British and American ambassadors protested that these Security Police were against the sacred agreements at Yalta, and that the elections, which a large number of agents watched for them, were grossly irregular. I envy the ease with which my friends choose between these contradictory reports, but that, I suppose, is the penalty I must pay for refusing to belong to any political party. I have to be content to follow a neutral authority (or certainly not pro-Russian) like the *Annual Register*, which says :—

> There were no indications of pressure being applied to influence voters, but a feature of the day in Warsaw was the collective marches of government employees to the booths.

On the whole, I prefer this to the Catholic methods under Pilsudski. The *Register* says that 11,400,000 of the 12,700,000 possible electors (male and female) voted, and that 9,000,000 of them voted for the Democratic Block; Socialists (the largest party), Communists (who in Poland work with the Socialists), and a section of the Peasants' Party who defy the clergy and support the Government (about a third of the Block). In the new Sejm, the opening of which the British and American ambassadors churlishly refused to attend, the Block had 394 seats, the People's Party had 28, and the Catholic Workers 12.

I will not attempt to draw any very definite conclusion from these figures, but they surely indicate, broadly, that Poland is no longer a Catholic country. In the last two or three months the chief developments are reported to be a rapid growth of the Communist Party, its fusion with the Socialist Party, and a drastic purge of both parties. The country is now ruled by this solid majority-block of Marxian Socialists. Periodically men " escape " to Britain and America, where they are encouraged to tell how the mass of the people groan under tyranny. Ever since the French Revolution the world has had such refugees and such stories. Some of them, like the tattered legend of the Prostitute on an Altar or the grossly inflated story of the September Massacre, are still cherished by folk to whom they appeal.

On the other hand, nearly every prominent London journalist who has gone beyond the " Iron Curtain " into Poland has given us a very much less agonizing story. Official Washington and Westminster expect war sooner or later. In view of this, it seems

natural to suppose that there is some truth in Polish complaints that they pay spies and trouble-makers, and that their best allies are the Catholic clergy. Cardinal Hlond, after a visit to Rome, led an open agitation against the Government; and we will hardly suppose that he and his priests disdainfully ignore the underground movement. It is very natural that the Church should fight for control of the schools; just as natural as for the Government to retort that in view of the shocking inefficiency of the schools up to 1939 the State will do better to take them over. In short, the present Papal policy in Poland, as in so many countries, is to pour oil, disguised as water, on the smouldering fires and trust to see a great conflagration as speedily as possible.

CHAPTER XII

DRIVING AMERICA INTO WAR

THE story of the Roman Church will, when the last chapter of it is written—which will probably be in the next century—have many romantic features, and not the least piquant of these will be its recovery in Protestant lands in the nineteenth century. The Catholic version of this, that it is due to floods of conversions, is, as usual, a calculated untruth. It is mainly due to the dispersal of the Irish over the English-speaking world.

In the last century a more deadly opponent than Luther—modern thought—attracted millions out of the Church in the lands which it had saved from the spread of Protestantism, and men began to talk about the last phase. Just then the strictly Catholic population that was pent up thickly within the confines of Eire poured over Britain and the Colonies and America. Not for frivolous theological reasons did the Church of Rome forbid birth control under pain of eternal damnation. Soon after this, other Catholic lands, chiefly Poland, Italy, and the Catholic provinces of Germany, also reached the bursting point. In 1909, when I wrote my *Decay of the Church of Rome* and drew attention to this fallacy of miraculous growth, the United States had received 44,502,613 immigrants from Europe and Canada, and of these, calculating by the percentage of Catholics in the land of origin, I found that 20,158,520 were Catholics. If you recollect that the first great stream went in from Ireland a little over one hundred years ago, you have some idea of the vast number of the descendants of these Catholic immigrants. In view of their clerically enforced fertility, they ought to number at least 40,000,000; and another generation has come on since I made that statement.

It took decades for the myopic Vatican to perceive the gorgeous possibilities for itself in this situation. Even to Leo XIII, with his spurious reputation for far-sighted statesmanship, America was a half-tamed wilderness on the fringe of civilization. One would almost imagine that the Vatican Library contained no work on it later than Charles Dickens' wicked little book. Occasionally a pilgrim came to Rome with a lamentable account of the way in which the Irish, Polish, Italian, Czech, and German immigrants and their descendants were allowed to lapse from the Church. In 1891 Mr. Cahensly and other American Catholics

submitted a memorial to the Pope in which they claimed that of 26,000,000 descendants of Catholic immigrants, 16,000,000 had drifted from the Church. Others said 20,000,000 or 25,000,000. But the Pope was more concerned about the way in which the American apologists were making Catholic theology digestible to the delicate American stomach. In 1899 he wrote a rebuke—a published letter—to Cardinal Gibbons and the Bishops on "Americanism" which must have raised the temperature of the country. By this time, however, very large sums of money were reaching the Vatican from the United States; and no other sound has ever been so stimulating to its somnolent inhabitants as the chink of gold.

Today the American branch of the Catholic Church is immeasurably the strongest, richest, best-organized, and probably the largest section of that ancient institution. How many Catholics are there in the 150,000,000 people of the United States? We have already found that such statistics are the loosest and most mendacious of all. I have the latest issue of the American *World Almanac*, which gives—probably from the bureau of the Apostolic Delegate or the Pope's special representative at Washington—the Catholic world-total as 329,775,663. That is more modest than some of the figures I have given in an earlier chapter, yet it is preposterous. When it says that 200,000,000 of these are in Europe it, in the usual way, counts nearly the whole populations of France, Belgium, Italy, Spain, Czecho-Slovakia, etc. We have seen that not one-half, probably not one-third, of these are Catholics. So when we find the total number of Catholics in the United States given as 26,075,697—as if they were carefully counted down to the last village idiot—we are prepared to deduct at least one-third. As I have already explained, the clergy now openly state that they take no notice of supposed secessions: you can't leave their Church. That is one of its beauties—and one of the beauties of its statistics.

In the case of America these statistics are particularly misleading to the inexpert, because the Government periodically publishes a Census of Religions. Characteristically, the publication is left to the Chamber of Commerce, and the profane officials of this do not pretend to take a census on so sacred a matter. They just ask the authorities of each Church how many adherents they claim; and modesty is not counted a virtue in making such claims. An American writer, John F. Moore, published some remarkable facts in his book *Will America Become Catholic?* (1931) about the way in which priests and bishops compile their statistics. He quotes Catholic writers complaining bitterly that the figures are dishonest, and he shows that where the figures of

dioceses or parishes were accurately checked, there was a shocking discrepancy. When I made a severe inquiry into the matter in 1909 I found that the Catholic total was exaggerated by several millions. For the first edition of this book in 1937—the practice of including seceders had in the meantime become general—I calculated that there were at the most 15,000,000 Catholics in the United States, whereas the Catholic Directories claimed 21,000,000 in 1928, and the Catholic-revised *Encyclopædia Britannica* raised the figure to 25,000,000. How such figures were reached was, almost with a feeling of shame, certainly with indignation, shown in an article in the Catholic *Fortnightly Review* of January 1, 1927. It quoted a bishop ordering his priests to include seceders, yet told that, while even this bishop claimed only 21,268 Catholics in his diocese, the *Official Catholic Directory* gave the number as 39,450; and the Catholic writer deplored the "padded statistics" and the "prevarication or downright stupidity."

When I was in the sacred circle in the Church we used to take it as a fair test of the total number of Catholics in a parish to multiply the number of school children by five. There are in the American Catholic schools, primary and high, 2,300,000 pupils, which would yield a total of about 11,500,000; and the higher school-age in our time ought to require a multiplication by more than five. Let us say that the genuine number today is between 16,000,000 and 18,000,000. And the first reflection that occurs to the social student who accepts this figure is: How on earth do 17,000,000 people in the best-educated and most advanced country in the world come to accept the farrago of doctrines, the weird medieval practices, and the intellectual tyranny of Catholicism?

Before you begin to speculate on this, reflect on two facts. In 1932 a Catholic prison chaplain, Fr. J. P. McCaffey, expressed his deep concern, in the Catholic *Commonweal* (December 14), that in the great New York jail, Sing Sing, under his charge no fewer than 855 out of the total of 1,581 criminals declared themselves Catholics; and New York is by no means the most Catholic city in the United States. Since that time Fr. McCaffey has collaborated with other Catholic chaplains in the larger American jails, and they have boldly published their figures, which betray the same situation. There is no copy of this important book in the British Museum Library, though it is the only book in English giving precise statistical indications on the question of crime and religion. Similar figures are available for several English cities and for Eire, Poland (as I said), Australia, New Zealand, and other countries. But no sociologist dare bring them together and expose the complete falsity of the Catholic claims of social service.

The second fact, which was brought out by the American Dr. L. B. Fry some years ago, is the cultural poverty of American Catholics. He showed that of the 30,000 Americans who had the distinction of being included in *Who's Who in America* the Catholics had only seven representatives for 100,000 of their number. The generally despised Fundamentalists had just the same proportion. The Unitarians had 1,185 per 100,000. As another American writer—in this case a Catholic—Arthur Preuss, says, "There are more intelligent leaders among the 3,000,000 Catholics of Ireland, and even among the 2,000,000 Catholics of England, than among the 21,000,000 of the United States." In other words, while we all admit that there are, as in England, plenty of decent folk of all grades of education in the Church, the big figures chiefly represent dense masses of ignorant descendants of Irish, Italian, French, Canadian, and other immigrants.

New York is, as I said, far from being the most Catholic city in America, yet only three years ago it witnessed quite medieval scenes. A mischievous little Italian boy, stimulated by the film "Lourdes" which the Catholics had imposed upon Hollywood, persuaded his parents, and they persuaded their neighbours, that the Virgin repeatedly appeared to him. Even some of the chief New York papers devoted respectful space, out of fear of Catholic readers and advertisers, to the agitation, and it culminated with the spectacle, of which photographs—I saw them—appeared in the best dailies, of 70,000 Catholics kneeling in the mud of waste ground in the Bronx expecting an apparition of the Virgin because this miserable little Italian urchin said she had promised to make a public appearance in godless New York. The hierarchy made no effort to check this folly, and would probably have punished any paper that attacked it.

In Chicago two years ago a nun, a very prosy and business-like lady, was "canonized." Now, this procedure demands that the saint was not only saintly, but had wrought miracles in the literal supernatural sense; and the American hierarchy agreed with the Roman that such literal miracles have been wrought by the nun in New York and Chicago in recent years. The American papers would have brought out double numbers at the time if anything that could plausibly be represented as a miracle had occurred.

There is, of course, the same proportion of college-trained men and women in the body of American Catholics as in Britain. There are judges, presidents of large corporations, a few professors even of the non-Catholic universities. At the same time even some American Catholic writers, quoted by Moore in the book I have mentioned, deplored the general cultural poverty and the

furious enthusiasm of the mass over the fact that some well-known baseball player like Babe Ruth or crooner like Bing Crosby is " one of us." An article with the title " Our Book-Poverty " appeared a few years ago in the Jesuit monthly *America*. The writer pointed out that Catholics had not contributed half a dozen writers of distinction to American literature, and that of fifty books chosen as the best religious books of one year, only three were Catholic. In art, science, and history they are just as poor, though they are by far the richest religious body in the world and claim to number one-sixth of the entire American population.

The big figure merely confirms what I said about the general Catholic boast of big figures. If we take the *World Almanac* figure of a world total of 350,000,000, more than one-third (120,000,000) of these are located in Latin America, the Philippines, Spain, and Portugal. We know how little significance there is in the beliefs of these. This Catholic-supplied figure then locates 200,000,000 in Europe, and I have given solid evidence that this should be reduced to not more than 100,000,000, a very large part of whom are on the same cultural level as the great body of the American Catholics. And remember always that the majority of these Catholics everywhere are children under seventeen. In virtue of the drastic priestly condemnation of birth control—I have known an English priest tell a meeting of Catholic mothers that this is in order to keep up the Church's big numbers —they have a higher proportion of children than the general population. This is particularly true in America, where, it is officially established, more than half the total number of families (15,000,000 out of 25,000,000) are childless, generally by restriction. We must remember, too, that it is mainly after the age of sixteen that they quit the Church.

Particularly in the classic land of " rugged individualism " large numbers make fortunes, though they are men of little culture, and the Church specially cultivates these. For one of my books I had occasion to make laborious research in the twenty-volume *Dictionary of American Biography* in order to ascertain the creed of the 200 among the 20,000 heroes and heroines of this American Valhalla who are classed as philanthropists. I will quote what I wrote at the time about the Catholic Church's share :—

> Roman Catholics, who are the loudest in boasting of the inspiration of their creed, are the most miserably represented of all denominations. Their church has been notoriously rich in wealthy men and women during the last hundred years, yet only five or six of these are found in the class of

philanthropists as determined by the *Dictionary*, and these confined their donations exclusively to Catholic Churches and institutions.

If any reader fancies that this is an offensive insinuation against Catholics, he knows very little about their ideas. Their Church advises them that to give more power to itself to save the souls of men is an immeasurably finer charity than to endow colleges and hospitals. As a result I was able to show that a score of sceptical philanthropists gave far more money for real service to the entire community than all the other philanthropists in the American *Dictionary* put together. Protestants and Jews were responsible for nearly all the other sums given or bequeathed for such purposes.

Thus the Papal policy in America in the last half century, zealously carried out by the hierarchy, made the American Catholic Church the richest corporation—I had nearly said racket—in that land of rich corporations. Ten years ago its wealth was carefully calculated to be about £800,000,000. It had multiplied eight-fold, while its membership had not doubled, in half a century. It is estimated that today, after ten years' gorgeous prosperity on account of the war and preparation for the next war, it must have at least £1,000,000,000. Its income was assessed by Catholic writers ten years ago—I have seen no later figure—as £160,000,000 ($800,000,000) a year. With this it is able to maintain the most powerful religious organization that the world has ever known. It has, under an Apostolic Delegate (special representative of the Pope), 153 cardinals, archbishops, and bishops, 41,747 priests, 5,000 churches, three universities, 228 seminaries, 100,000 teachers in its schools, 80,000 nuns, 824 hospitals, 365 orphanages, 248 homes for the aged. It has four radio transmitting stations of its own, flooding America with "Catholic Truth" every day, several daily newspapers, and nearly 300 weeklies and monthlies. It pours out pamphlets and booklets by the million, and occasionally subsidises or drives Hollywood into issuing a Catholic film, though the dearth of first-class heroines of exceptional virtue for "St. Joan" and the Virgin in "Lourdes" was embarrassing. The ladies are apt to reappear in the columns of the Press.

Here you have so vast an army of paid or professional workers for the corporation that one is surprised to find them boasting that the annual crop of converts is only about 100,000 (while far more quit every year, as the statistics show). Dr. Morrison once wickedly calculated that the Catholic missionaries in China converted "nine-tenths of a Chinaman per person per annum."

One wonders what fraction of an American should be ascribed to each of these hundreds of thousands of proselytizing agents per year. For apart from their varied services to the Catholic body, M.A.C. (which is not a symbol for me but for " Make America Catholic ") is on the lips of all. All ages, both sexes, and all conditions of men and women are drafted into societies or confraternities. Nearly a million men are bound together in the Knights of Columbus—they are, of course, unaware that the medieval Knights were an intolerably corrupt body—a society which combines the secular benefits and the melodramatic secrecy of Freemasonry with attendance at church and service to one's country.

Collier's Weekly, a most discreet neutral weekly, had an article on Tammany on February 11, 1933, showing that thirty-four of its thirty-six captains of divisions were Catholics, and Cardinal Hayes had a clerical representative on its Board of Strategy; and the writer cynically added that " the entire system has its being in prostitution." Al Smith was its candidate for the presidency in 1927, with the support of all the brewers in America.

Besides these are large and formidable societies of Catholic women; veritable Amazons (except as to the breasts), who make movie-producers and actresses, publishers, editors, artists, etc., turn pale with apprehension—girls, youths, children, teachers, doctors, journalists, etc., all pledged to M.A.C. and trained like American athletes for the work. In so far as their object is to proselytize, the aim, in spite of the vast funds at the back of it, is a failure. The Church loses far more than it gains in this way. But if you ask why in an age like ours and in such a country as America—though a recent Gallup survey established that in proportion to population there is much less serious reading in America than in Britain—the leakage is not far greater, this vast organization and the colossal wealth spent on and through it is the chief answer.

It is generally known that, while one of the most strenuous aims of this organization is to induce non-Catholics to read Catholic literature, the Church forbids Catholics to read any works that contradict or criticize it. As I said, common human principles like " Read both sides " do not apply in the Catholic Church; " Error has not the same right as truth," their leading moral philosopher blandly replies. But there is a general opinion among outsiders that this applies only to books that are " on the Index," and few appreciate the formidable nature—to the Catholic—of the prohibition. Every Catholic knows that he or she, in the Church's very strict teaching, incurs the penalty of eternal damnation if he or she reads, without express permission,

any book " against the faith," which charge includes any work that exposes any of the innumerable false statements of Catholic literature, criticizes its doctrines, however politely, or tells the truth about its history. The Index is rarely used today. No book of mine is on the Index as far as I know, but my books are so dreaded that I have been assured by a Catholic young lady who borrowed one of them from me that the local (London) priest, finding it in her home, took it up with the tongs and put it on the fire. The rare Catholic who ever ventures to read critical literature is not a full believer. The teaching of the Church is peremptory; and it applies also to hearing lectures or attending non-Catholic services.

The man who thinks that the Catholic writer, thus protected from criticism, will be very sensitive about the truth of his statements lives in cloudland. In conversation with both American and British ex-priests, of whom there are hundreds, I have found a general agreement that at least half the priests are sceptical in some degree and, as one would gather from their remaining in the Church, not morally sensitive. In any case, in the hundred or so books (out of a total of about 250) in which I criticize Catholicism, I have exposed tens of thousands of false statements in Catholic literature, and some of these have been refuted so often that one is justified in calling them untruths. Last year I followed up with an examination of untruth in the *Catholic Encyclopædia*. They never reply. One reader wrote me that when he asked at the chief Catholic bookshop in London for some reply to my work he was referred to the Irish Catholic Truth Society in Dublin. All that these people could send him was a silly little threepenny booklet by an American Jesuit, published in America, in a footnote of which the Catholic reader was warned to avoid my books because I am " utterly unscrupulous." They dare not even sell this paltry and cowardly trash in Britain. Yet what a gorgeous opportunity the Catholic apologist ought to find in the hundred or so works, many with a circulation of 50,000 to 100,000, in which I criticize the Church, if they are so inaccurate and untruthful!

The Catholic radio stations in America are used in the same mighty crusade, day and night, to M.A.C. A Baltimore lady used to send me sheaves of reports, which she had taken down in shorthand, of artlessly artful speeches by professors, priests, and nuns addressed to the general American public. The recklessness of statements is amazing, but no radio circuit will permit a reply, very few papers admit replies in their columns, and no publisher except my own (the Haldeman-Julius Co.) would accept a critical book if any professor dared to write one. These Catholics have

even tried, and have at least shown that if ever they had the power they would secure this, to get a legal prohibition of the utterance or publication of such criticisms; just as Australian Catholics recently induced the Labour Government of Victoria, shortly before it was displaced, to try to bring criticism of their Church under the penal law against obscenity! In 1942 I wrote for my American readers a large work (five times as large as this) in which I gave a full account, with complete evidence, of the story of Papal policy with which here I have to deal rather summarily. Catholics —one Catholic periodical boasted of this—induced Washington to send two Federal Police (or G-men) to call upon my publisher in the heart of Kansas and demand the suppression of the book. Encouraged by this, they persuaded the Customs authorities at New York to ban the importation of my books, but my friend Mr. Joseph Lewis and his New York Rationalists took the authorities to court and compelled them to withdraw the ban. And during the whole of this period Catholics were as loud as other citizens in chanting the praise of America as the unique land of complete liberty and avowing their readiness to shed their (or somebody's) blood and dollars to secure the same freedom for the poor slaves of Eastern Europe. Surely, you may reflect, that is a raw inconsistency at which America must have smiled. Not in the least. They had only to say that in criticizing the Church I—quite suddenly I had become a writer of influence—was disturbing the national unity. Meantime the Catholics themselves were violently attacking all their opponents in the country. Catholics are the most skilful phrase-makers in this land of phrase-makers.

How about one-tenth of the population obtains this influence on Congress is not quite clear to English folk; even at this time (February 1950), when English Catholics are blatantly attempting to influence the issue of a General Election. Since the American Government itself imposes upon the people in its official *Census of Religion* the Catholic claim that they have about 25,000,000 followers, and in any case politicians have no time to examine such difficult matters, they assume that the Church controls—Land of Liberty again—about 10,000,000 votes. The peculiar value of this in America is that these votes are for the most part concentrated in half a dozen cities. Catholics notoriously rule Boston, and in San Francisco friends assured me, perhaps with some exaggeration, that they govern that city. In virtuous Chicago they claim the allegiance of one-third of the citizens. One of the most respected journalists of New York, Heywood Broun, who has since entered the Church, said ten years ago that "there is not a single New York editor who does not live in terror of that group."; and a New York publisher told me the same

about his world. University professors in Baltimore told me that they dare not sneeze without the permission of the priests. I spent a month once lecturing in the Unitarian chapel in Kansas City, often dealing with Catholic matters; and I shuddered when, on the last day, a merchant told me, in the presence of the chief criminal lawyer, that in their city you could hire men to "bump off" anybody for from "ten to fifteen dollars." Wasn't I worth that much?

The failure of this vast and most costly propaganda—for the growth of the real Catholic population does not, in spite of the high birth-rate, keep up with the general growth of population—is particularly galling to Rome because, in view of the huge sums Americans send to the Vatican, it now allows them to put an entirely false version of Catholic social theology before the people. I have already described how in 1899 the Pope sternly and publicly rebuked Cardinal Gibbons and his bishops for "Americanism." The Cardinal had assured America that "if a Pope ever meddled in secular matters any Catholic would be bound not to obey the Pope or, rather, his conscience would bind him absolutely to disobey." He did not explain that on Catholic principles it must be left to the Pope to say when he is interfering unduly, and in the following years nearly 1,000,000 copies of the Cardinal's book were given away in America, while another 1,000,000 were sold.

In 1928 Al Smith, Catholic Governor of New York, was put up as a candidate for the Presidency by the Catholics (and the brewers and anti-prohibitionists). One Catholic periodical, *The Missionary*, predicted that his success would be followed by "a stampede of the great majority of the nation into the Church." He was ignominously beaten—some told me that they just heard him on the radio and concluded that he was a rough-neck who was not fit for the post—although he had published a declaration of faith (written for him by a priest, I heard) in the *Atlantic Monthly* (May 1927) giving a mendacious account of the Church's teaching on toleration, obedience, Church and State, etc. Mgr. Ryan, head of the Washington Catholic University and chief authority on these matters, deals very casuistically with these questions in his works, and lesser apologists go to ridiculous lengths. Father Hyland writes that "the Constitution of the United States is modelled on that of the Constitutions of the Dominican and Jesuit Orders," and it is now a commonplace of their literature that the idea of democracy was derived, through the (expressly materialist) writings of Jefferson, from the works of the seventeenth-century Jesuits Suarez and Bellarmine. They know well, but never remind folk of it, that the only grain of fact at the base

of this fantastic claim is that by the year 1600 half the monarchs of Europe were Protestants, so the Jesuits " discovered " that it was lawful for a people to rebel against, depose, and execute their kings in certain conditions. Specifically they wanted the people of England to rise against Elizabeth and adopt the Catholic King of Spain.

There are superior folk who think that it is a symptom of a finer type of mind to pass these things by and devote one's life rather to the art of Cézanne, the music of Bach, the style of D. H. Lawrence, the pottery of the Ming Dynasty, the behaviour of ants, or the philosophy of John Dewey. On the contrary, this tyranny and trickery of the Roman Church have a very real social significance. You cannot teach folk to follow one set of principles or methods in regard to religion and expect them to adopt a radically different set in regard to the problems of real life. You cannot spend your days howling about totalitarianism in Eastern Europe and Asia and submit to a creed that is more totalitarian than any national economy. Catholic law and policy, as I have described them and the ruthless application of them by the modern Papacy, are pure totalitarianism. Everything, even truth and peace, must be sacrificed in the name of the interests of the Church. In no other way can one explain the tragic story of Papal policy that I have told.

And the last phase of it is worse than the preceding. No one doubts that the race confronts one of the, indeed *the*, gravest and most pregnant decisions that it ever did confront. This is not the place to inquire what evidence there is of aggressive intentions on the part of Russia. Perhaps I may be suffered to say that in four years assiduous reading of British and American periodical literature I have found none. But I have seen and could pile up a mountain of evidence that certain elements in America and Western Europe want Communism destroyed, and when that is accomplished will want Socialism destroyed—for this is the real antithesis to private enterprise—and it can be destroyed only by war, especially now that China has joined Russia. It is crude to ask: Does America want war? The real question is: What elements in America want war?

Whatever one may think about other elements, the Catholic Church has strained every nerve for the last four years to drive America into war. It is, as I showed, thirteen years since the present Pope, as Secretary of State, put into the mouth of his predecessor a strident appeal to the powers of the world to " destroy Bolshevism from Russia to China, from Mexico to South America." Indeed, the work in the name of the Pope had begun in America in 1925 when the Jesuits, expelled from Russia for

breach of agreement, opened the poisonous campaign against the Soviet Union. But for that world campaign, in which the international forces of the Vatican were the most active, the Soviet Union might have joined much earlier against the Nazis and saved a terrible amount of tragedy. When it was at last forced to join, it silenced the lips of most of its critics for two or three years; though even in the English Catholic Press there were stupid appeals to us to die rather than accept Russia as an ally. American Catholics have not only drenched their own people, by their Press and radio speeches, with a hatred of Russia and a thirst for its destruction by atom-bombs and poison sprays, but they have spent millions of dollars poisoning the mind of the whole community. The Knights of Columbus, a body of enormous wealth, has spent immense sums buying two-column space in non-Catholic papers for articles, written by themselves, decorated at the top with red-ink drawings of Soviet soldiers with the faces of gorillas sticking their bayonets into women and children who lie prostrate before them. I have seen plenty of these prostitutions of the Press. This has gone on, in varying degrees, all over the " civilized " world for four years—in the Catholic Press for ten years—and some ask us to ignore it and appreciate rather the good which this powerful Church, with its record of crime and its vile Papal policy, does in our distracted world.

CHAPTER XIII

HOW BRITISH CATHOLICS ARE DUPED

THREE or four years ago a priest, chaplain to a rich nunnery, died in London and was sped on his way to heaven with the sombrely rich ritual of such departures. He had money, and the good nuns, who had paid him a generous salary, were flutteringly interested in his will and were shockingly disappointed. This priest had regularly supplied me with news, and one of these pieces of information which I felt that it would be churlish to retain in *in petto*, to use proper ecclesiastical language, concerned the canonization, some years ago, of Sir Thomas More. It will at once illustrate why I say that British Catholics are duped by the Vatican and its hierarchic representatives in England. Our Press and even our cinemas were lavishly used to impress upon the general public the unique moral grandeur of the Roman Church. One of the greatest Englishmen of the days of Henry VIII, which were as frivolous as those of the medieval world generally, was not only a Catholic, but a man of such exceptional piety and austerity that he laid down his life rather than repeat a formula which was repugnant to his conscience. The Press did not inquire why Rome had taken 350 years to discover this, but since no one can question More's piety and asceticism, except during a few years of his early manhood, we do not cavil at the decoration of one of our keenest wits with the same halo as Francis of Assisi, the truculent Dominic, or the wily Ignatius. It is true that some of our more gossipy journalists might have liked to say a little about the More who wrote the famous *Utopia*, the picture of an ideal republic in which there were no Popes and in which ministers of religion were very restricted in number and confined to delivering ethical lectures. They may have known that it was in More's house in London that his intimate friend Erasmus, the great sceptic, wrote his *Encomium Moriæ* (or Praise of Folly, but the Latin title is a friendly pun on More's name), in which Popes, bishops, and priests are treated with sizzling contempt. But these truths would be " offensive to our Catholic fellow-citizens " if they were told on so joyous and solemn an occasion.

What I deprecate is the concealment of facts, at the wish of the Catholic clergy, which the public ought to know. A canonization of a man is not, as the Press represented, merely an official

declaration that he was a man of exceptionally high character. It is a solemn affirmation that he, or his relics, have wrought at least three miracles in the strictest sense of the word. Every Catholic in Britain must believe that, but educated Catholics and their clergy are not eager to let the general public know it. Outsiders of simple mind might then want to know why the Vatican took 500 years in the case of Joan of Arc and 350 years in the case of Thomas More to discover these remarkable events. They might then learn that these picturesque canonizations are in large part for the purpose of local propaganda, and in still larger part for the enrichment of the Vatican and its hungry Italian dependants. The information secretly given to me was that the canonization of More cost the English Catholics £17,000. The fees of the Roman courts and officials amounted to £13,000, which caused consternation in Westminster. Every one of the venerable cardinals you saw (on the screen) encircling the Pope's throne at the final ceremony demanded a fat fee; and, grudgingly, when the English clergy pressed for a representative, one priest was permitted to hold a candle in the sanctuary—and pay £5 for the privilege. Further, Rome always suggests a souvenir for the Pope on such occasions, and the nuns of all the convents in South London begged to have the joy of paying for this. They said their prayers very hurriedly when they received a bill for £4,000 for a solid gold chalice, provided by Rome, of course, for His Holiness. I gather that the canonization of Joan of Arc had been much more frugal, but doubtless the Americans paid far more generously for the recent canonization to which I referred in the preceding chapter. Probably it was a much more laborious task to establish the three miracles that occurred in New York and Chicago in our time.

Another illustration of the way in which British Catholics are duped. Some years ago a Catholic Hollywood actress fell in love with a non-Catholic married technician. He divorced his wife, but no Catholic can marry a divorced person. How is it that she married him and remained in good odour in the Church? He had taken the precaution to become a Catholic and demand that his wife (a Jewess, I believe) do the same. She naturally refused, and their marriage melted into thin air from the Catholic point of view. I told this to my friend Dr. Marie Stopes, and she spoke of it in her weekly paper; and in the next issue of one of the Catholic weeklies we were both charged, very derisively, with crass ignorance of Catholic matters. This leading Catholic journalist or his editor had, apparently, never heard of the Pauline Privilege!

Very few of them seem to understand the technique of the annulment of marriages, which is a source of great profit (for

clerical expenses, naturally) to one of the Vatican courts. The marriage of Marconi to Lady Beatrice O'Brien in 1905 was declared null twenty years later. Beatrice found that she had not *really* in her own mind consented to the marriage in 1905. Consuelo Vanderbilt made the same plea in regard to her marriage to the Duke of Marlborough. Mamma had simply forced her into it; and two sons (whom Rome declared legitimate, though the marriage was invalid) had blessed the union. In the case of these rich Catholics the fee is generally £10,000 to £20,000. Just recently the Vatican has angrily denounced the Italian Government for, contrary to agreement, granting divorce. It was to be left to the Church to " annul " marriages—for a consideration. The English hierarchy have never published a translation of the Code of Canon Law of 1907, which minutely regulates the life of the faithful. Its provisions in regard to marriage and toleration, for instance, would outrage public opinion.

The chief instrument of the Church in securing such a hold upon one or two million folk in a highly sceptical world that it can order them to urge their neighbours to read both sides and sternly forbid them to read both sides themselves, is the Catholic school. I write this on the eve of the General Election of February 1950, and from Southampton to Aberdeen, from Swansea to Colchester, the Church marshals its forces in a desperate attempt to influence the issue. The Church, of course, never interferes in politics. It threatens the Labour Party that it will, by dictating 1,000,000 votes, drive it out of power if it will not grant the Catholic demand of full maintenance of their schools, and promises the Conservative Party to put it in power if it promises this. But it is not concerned with the political consequence of its action; it looks only to the interest of religion. Moreover, it is prepared, I understand, to make a " reasonable " offer. It will continue to provide the schools if the Government provides full maintenance. The Government may control the whole of the secular education, the Church merely retaining the right to give a few Catholic lessons.

That is a gross deception of the public. What the Church prizes above all is the " Catholic atmosphere " of the school. The very walls must shine with holy statues and pictures. Catholic untruth must pervade all the teaching. History lessons—the chief foundation of a Catholic education—are steeped in Catholic untruth. It tinges the lessons on geography and literature and is a large part of " general information." In the school the child is prepared for a monthly confession of its sins to a priest, which begins at the age of seven (when, the Church says, it begins to be liable to the hell-sentence), and learns the characteristic

disdain of other creeds. Hymns and prayers must be heard daily. . . .

To the sympathetic outsider the plea is made that this intensive religious education is of the highest social service in checking crime, and these outsiders never take the least trouble to examine the claim in the light of facts. I have already said that in the case of pre-war Poland, Eire, Australia, and New Zealand any inquirer can ascertain that it is the reverse of the truth, but there is ample and striking evidence in this country. The Rev. Alderman Longbottom, F.R.E.S., in a booklet with the title *Rome and Responsibility for Juvenile Crime* examines the official statistics of Liverpool, the most Catholic city—because the nearest port to Ireland—in Great Britain. Its population is one-third Catholic, and its Catholic boy-delinquents are 237 per 10,000 boys, while the proportion is only 83 for the whole of England and Wales, and 82 per cent of that 237 were educated in Catholic schools. Mr. Longbottom traces this sinister influence all through the statistics. A similar analysis, showing the same situation, has been published for Bradford. In fact, the most Catholic cities in Britain—Liverpool, Glasgow, Manchester, Newcastle, and Bradford—are well below the honesty average for the whole country. Our Government no longer obliges sociologists by inserting in the criminal statistics the details that show the true relation of crime and religious education, which is supposed to be of paramount importance. I looked up the official report of March 28, 1906, and learned that there were then 5,378 Catholic prisoners in jail out of a total of 25,000. In other words, Catholics had the distinction of being represented in our criminal population by 247 per 100,000 of their body. The Church of England, to which convicts are most apt to say they belong, had only 118 per 100,000, the Methodists 10, the Baptists 9. The priests seem to have given a hint to the Government that the publication of such details is " offensive to Catholics."

In the preceding chapter I showed that while the American Catholic Church is rich in enterprising criminals it is very poor in leaders of culture. In the front ranks of science, history, economics, etc., they are almost as rare as Arabs among Arctic explorers, and, says the apologist, even in literature we will not boast too loudly of our representatives: Joyce Kilmer (who, whatever you may think of him, died decades ago), Carlton Hayes, Michael Williams, G. W. Schuster, Kathleen Norris, and Agnes Repplier. You may have heard of some of these. But, says the American apologist, it is very different in Britain, where literary stars of the first magnitude form a galaxy. He enumerates Father Martindale, Father Knox, G. K. Chesterton (in his

later years), Noyes, Shane Leslie, A. C. Benson, and Sheila Kaye-Smith. How poor our best literature would be without them! We could add a few names of recent converts, for it is almost entirely in the literary world that the converter makes his catches. A literary man or woman has been defined as one who writes gracefully about everything and knows nothing.

Or examine, if you have a few hours to waste, the *Catholic Who's Who*, a book of snobs if ever there was one. You could put on one page the names of all men of the kind of intellectual distinction which would fit a man to tackle problems of either politics or religion. The nearest approach are the literary or artistic folk, but these are too rich in intuition to look for factual evidence; besides, those of them whom I have met do not quite see eye to eye with the Pope even on theological matters. The great majority in the book are folk who have the distinction of being supported by the nation, since they never work. Titles and diamonds glitter on every page. Perhaps military and naval commanders, who are not keenly intellectual, come next, and—significantly—men high in the diplomatic service are fairly numerous. Study, on the other hand, such a list of men of world distinction as that of the Nobel Prize winners. Those who have won the literary prize have generally revealed their views on religion, but you may take a short cut by examining how many names in the list are claimed in the *Catholic Encyclopædia*—three out of 200 recipients since 1900—and these are by no means in the front rank. Catholics boast that they are a fifth of the race. They are scarcely a hundredth of the men selected for international recognition.

Where the Church is well represented is in the journalistic world. A Catholic writer claimed the other day that the disappearance of criticisms of his Church from our dailies and weeklies is one of the signs that Britain is getting nearer to the true Church. That is the kind of stuff they tell each other at their lunches and tea-parties. The Westminster Catholic Federation could tell them a different story. Why you never now see in the big-circulation papers the old-fashioned type of letter or book review criticizing Catholics, why you find so much space and so respectfully given to Papal affairs, why every clerical traitor on the other side of the Iron Curtain becomes a figure of world-importance, is because Catholics are numerous on the staffs and Catholics threaten the circulation or the advertisement revenue. Mr. J. W. Poynter, one of the conspirators in the vaults of the Westminster Federation who broke away in disgust (and later returned), tells some remarkable stories about their work in his books. Discussing with me one day the fact that they never reply

to my criticisms, though my books, as I said, circulate by the ten thousand, he told me that the *mot d'ordre* was: Never mention McCabe, and as far as possible see that he is never mentioned. They hoped, he said, to bring me down with the economic weapon. Certainly hardly any metropolitan paper will now review my books or admit a letter of mine; and I have heard repeatedly of threats to booksellers who exposed my works for sale. The economic pressure on me for the last thirty or forty years has been so ineffective that I still flourish at the age of eighty-three, writing five or six books a year for America. But is it a matter of social indifference that an organization of a thoroughly medieval and totalitarian character, a body numbering about one-twentieth of the nation (as we shall see), should have this power of misdirecting the main instruments of public instruction?

This position is unquestionably occupied by our daily and weekly Press today, but the Catholic authorities, encouraged by their astonishing success, aspire to a larger power. To an American correspondent who some years ago asked if it was true that until about seventy years ago emasculated men (soprani) sang in the Papal choir at Rome I replied that it was so true that he would find it stated as an unquestioned fact in the *Encyclopædia Britannica* (article "Eunuchs") as well as Grove's and other Dictionaries of Music. He replied that he had the latest edition of the *Britannica* and it stated almost the opposite; and I then inquired and found a very singular situation. After the completion of the fourteenth edition the Westminster Catholic Federation inserted this notice in its annual report of 1928:—

> The revision of the *Encyclopædia Britannica* was undertaken with a view to eliminate matter which was objectionable from a Catholic point of view and to insert what was accurate and unbiased. The whole of the 28 volumes were examined, objectionable parts noted, and the reasons for their deletion or amendment given. There is every reason to hope that the new edition of the *Britannica* will be found very much more accurate and impartial than its predecessors.

Note that the word "revision" is theirs, not mine. What the publishers or the editors of the *Encyclopædia* said about this amazing public declaration I do not know, but on August 9, 1929, the Agony Column of *The Times* contained, among its tearful messages to young ladies and advertisements of lost pets, a long explanation—the longest ever seen in those columns—from the Federation. They deny that they have ever claimed to have "exercised any influence whatever upon the editing of the *Encyclopædia*." All that had happened was that the Federation

complained of certain "statements of fact," and its "Vigilance Sub-Committee" was permitted to "draw attention to certain errors of date and other facts regarding the teaching and discipline of the Catholic Church."

The hundreds of altered articles, most of which have nothing to do with "the teaching and discipline" of the Church, are usually initialled X—which is itself a singular innovation in encyclopædia practice—and if the reader cares to spend an hour or two comparing the articles thus decorated with the articles in previous editions he will see that this explanation is as gross a deception of the public as the articles themselves. For instance, in the Eleventh Edition it was correctly said in the article "Eunuchs":—

> Driven long ago from the stage by public opinion, they remained the musical glory and the moral shame of the Papal choir till the accession of Pope Leo XIII (1878), one of whose first acts was to get rid of them.

That boys were castrated for singing in the Papal choir and other Roman Churches was one of the commonplaces of Roman life until about 1880. Forty or fifty years ago I met men who had dined with the more famous of these and pleasantly discussed their condition. Yet, not only is that statement cut out of the Fourteenth Edition, but the impression is deliberately given that Leo XIII found the practice in the theatrical world (which had long abandoned it while the Churches retained it) and indignantly suppressed it.

Who are these Catholics who want our books suppressed if we tell the truth about them, who poison the wells of public instruction, who claim the fullest rights and tell us that we, being in error, have no rights, who demand that we shall pay for their weird and socially mischievous system of education, who bully our booksellers, editors, publishers, and public libraries if these give publicity to anything that is "offensive to Catholics"? They claim in the latest edition of the *Catholic Directory* that they number 2,754,249 in England and Wales and 600,000 in Scotland. But we have seen clear ground in every chapter to regard their figures as monstrously exaggerated, and we find the same here; besides that, as we have seen, when they say that so many in a country are Catholics, they mean that they were baptised, almost always as babes a week or two old, whether or no they are still Catholics. Wherever you test their figures they crumble, for the laws of arithmetic are no more respected in the sacred world than are the laws of logic. For instance, the *Directory* says that the number of child-baptisms in 1924 was 92,303. Since the total number of births in England and Wales was only 777,948, this

would make the Catholics about one-eighth of the nation, and they modestly claim to be only one-sixteenth. As a matter of fact, everybody knows how poor parents, especially the Irish who never themselves go to church, insist on having the child christened. The feast adds to the slender gaiety of life. But take the next item, the number of children in the elementary schools. These are said to be 363,211, which is only one-sixteenth of the total number of elementary school pupils; and, disgraceful as the death-rate still is in the poor quarters of our towns, it would be ridiculous to offer it as an explanation of this discrepancy.

In point of fact, if I remember my clerical days correctly, we used to find the total number of our Catholics in any parish by multiplying the number of school children by five. If we do this we get a Catholic total for England and Wales of 1,816,055, not 2,754,249. And that is a maximum estimate. But since I moved in the clerical world fifty-eight years ago there have been great social changes that have to be taken into account. After leaving school, Catholic children now quit their Church in extraordinary numbers. In 1939 the *Catholic Herald* (August 11) published the result of an inquiry in a London parish. The priest in charge said that 61 per cent of the boys who passed through his school left the Church. In 1940 a Liverpool teacher, speaking at a conference of the Catholic Young Men's Society at Newcastle, reported in the *Newcastle Evening Chronicle*, said that the leakage of post-school children in the North of England, where the chief Catholic centres are, amounted to 50 per cent. There was a good deal of discussion in the Catholic world, and a heavy leakage, put variously from 40 to 60 per cent, was generally admitted. Remember that all these seceders are included in the grand total of the faithful.

As a matter of fact, these Catholic totals, so precise to the last digit, which are reproduced so respectfully in our Press and reference books, are the grossest deception. No priest with a large parish in a city has any idea how many of the supposed Catholics of that district are genuine members of the Church. In my clerical days I once had to spend a week-end helping a parish priest in Canning Town. He had that Sunday afternoon to fill up the report to the Archbishop about his parish. I gave the facts and figures in my *Twelve Years in a Monastery* (first edition, 1897) while they were fresh in my memory. The priest said that there were about 6,000 nominal Catholics (baptised) in his parish, but to make any statement about the number of real Catholics—remember that they incur hell if they do not attend church on Sunday morning—we had to measure the seating accommodation

of the church (it was only 400) and make a broad estimate how many attended. To the question how many nominally Catholic youths attended he replied : About 5 per. cent. I gave a large amount of similar evidence for other East London parishes. There were supposed to be 250,000 Catholics in London, but a strict *Daily News* census, early in this century, proved that only 90,000 attended church, and if to these you add the very young children and invalids you get a total of about 120,000. Once more we take off 50 per cent. It becomes almost a rule.

Instead, therefore, of wasting our time over such delusive figures as 2,754,249, we see that not even a bishop has the least idea within 100,000 of the size of the Catholic body in England, France, America, Italy, etc.—not within 1,000,000—and it is just loose calculation to attempt to give the number within 500,000 or even 1,000,000. For the leakage in the north is now at least as bad as in the south. In December 1947 the *Sunday Graphic* published a series of articles by Dean Elliott in each of which he gave in detail the results of a census of church-going in northern cities. I must explain that this referred to Sunday evening, and Catholics have not the same grim obligation to attend service in the evening, but they generally do.

In Catholic Liverpool only 68,000 Catholics attended; in largely Catholic Manchester 55,000; in Birmingham 20,000; and in Newcastle 7,000. All these are reputed very Catholic cities. In Glasgow, where, according to the *Directory* claims, there ought to be at least 200,000 Catholics, 26,000 attended the Catholic Sunday evening service. The book-figures are worse than useless. They lie. There are not 2,000,000, probably not more than 1,500,000 Catholics, in our 45,000,000 population. A third of these are children, the majority Irish or descendants of Irish. And they still pour in. The *Cork Examiner* stated that in the first nine months of the year 1937 we received 40,000 (or far more than our Government reported) immigrants from Eire. The river has become a flood in recent years. One sometimes wonders whether Catholic authorities in England, who see their Church thus gloriously expanding, have anything to do with the very peculiar situation, that Eire declares itself a " completely independent Republic," yet its subjects are not foreigners in Britain, which it hates.

Whether our Catholics number 1,000,000 or 2,000,000 they nobly sustain the present policy of the Papacy, which has been formulated a hundred times, as " the extinction of Bolshevism "; and not by prayer and fasting. Their popular weeklies have been for twenty years—except when the Soviet army helped to save us by drawing off the Nazis—the worst purveyors of the poison of

racial hatred in Europe. Their cries are the most strident of all when some priest, bishop, or archbishop in the Balkans or Poland stealthily co-operates, as common sense would lead us to expect him to do, with the British and American agents against their Governments. They have helped enormously, by their influence in the Trade Unions, to make Britain America's chief air-base and the immediate target for the Russian atom-bombs if the horrible tragedy of the war they want ever occurs. We are " the slice of ham between the two pieces of bread," as Professor Hogben has recently described our position. Never since the bloody years between 1820 and 1860 has Papal policy been so profoundly detrimental to the peace, prosperity, and friendly co-operation of the human family. And just as I write this the Press tells us that the Pope has composed and said this prayer to 60,000 pilgrims in Rome :—

> Lord, stop hatred. Disperse by Thy powerful breath greed of domination, wars, destruction. Give bread to the little ones, houses to the roofless, work to the unemployed, understanding among the people, peace to the world, and eternal salvation to everybody.

Which is the real Pope—this long and tragic record of events or that short prayer?

INDEX

Abyssinia and the Papacy, 24–5
Acton, Lord, v, 21
Almedingen, Miss, 11
Alsace-Lorraine and the Church, 84
American Popular Revolutionary Alliance, 56
" Americanism," 112, 120
Annual Register, the, 42, 47, 50, 58, 64, 87, 109
Apostates in Canon Law, 4–8
Arabs, the, in Spain, 33
Argentina, religion in, 58
Asiatic policy, the, 13
Austria, 62

Bavarian People's Party, 42
Belgium, the Church in, 90
Bell, E. P., 25
Bellarmine, Cardinal, 120
Billot, Cardinal, 3
Blennerhassett, Lady, 21
Blood Purge, the Nazi, 44
Bolshevism, the Pope and, 10–12, 35, 121
Boston, the Church in, 119
Bourbons, the Spanish, 38
Braga, Dr., 56
Brazil, the Church in, 59
Broun, H., 119
Brutality in reprisals, 20
Buddhism, corruption and, 93
Buisson, F., 85

Cabacedas, Admiral, 39
Cadoux, Dr., 3
Calcott, W. H., 55
Cambridge Modern History, the, 20
Canon Law, 4–7
Canonization of Sir Thomas More, 123
Carmona, General, 39
Catholic Directory, 113, 129
Encyclopædia, 11, 127
Times, 47, 95
Catholic Truth Society, 35
Cecil, Lord, 86
Censorship, Roman, 117
Centre Party, 42
Chiang Kai-Shek, 95
Chicherin, 12
China, religion in, 98
Churchill, Mr., 26
Christian Socialism, 63
Civiltá Cattolica, the, 28
Collier's Weekly, 117
Columbus, Knights of, 12, 122
Communism, 10–12, 35
Concordat, the German, 26
the Italian, 22
Cork Examiner, the, 131
Crime and Catholicism, 113, 126
Crux Ansata, v
Czecho-Slovakia and the Vatican, 17, 72

Dabby, H. G., 39
Death-sentence on heretics, 2–4
Decay of the Church, 88, 112
Democracy and the Jesuits, 120
Dollfuss, Chancellor, 65
Driberg, Tom, 32

Easter Rebellion, the, 78
Elections, German, 41
Italian, 21, 30
Spanish, 34
Encyclopædia Britannica, the, 128
End and means, 7
Eunuchs in church choirs, 128

Fascism, results of, 24
Faulhaber, Cardinal, 43, 44
Forbes, Rosita, 56
Fortnightly Review, the, 113
Franciscan monks, vices of, 44, 53
Franco, General, 15, 36

Gasparri, Cardinal, 2, 14
Gaulle, General de, 89
Genoa Conference, the, 12
Gibbons, Cardinal, 120
Goyau, G., 83
Gwynn, D., 83

Hastings, Viscount, 60
Heimwehr, the, 64

Henlein, 74
Herald-Tribune, the, 104
Heretics in Canon Law, 4, 5
Hinsley, Cardinal, 25
Hitler, 40–50
Hlinka, Fr., 75
Hugenburg, 41
Hyland, Fr., 120

Innitzer, Cardinal, 17, 67
Ireland, the Church in, 78, 111
Irish Independent, the, 44, 73
Press, the, 78

Japan and the Vatican, 93–8
Jews, the, in Germany, 44
in Italy, 25

Knights of Columbus, 12, 122
Knox, Fr. R., 4

Labour Movement and the Church, 125
Lamennais, Fr., 21
La Piana, Professor, 28
Laval, 86
Lawton, L., 11
Lenin and the Vatican, 10
Lépicier, Cardinal, 5
Lerroux, A., 34
Listowel, Lord, 34
Litvinov, Mrs., 10
Losses of the Church in America, 111–12
Austria, 64
Czecho-Slovakia, 73
England, 130, 131
France, 83
Germany, 41
Italy, 21
Latin America, 56
Spain, 34
Luca, Fr. Marianus da, 4

Macartney, C. S., 63, 64
McCaffey, Fr., 113
Manchester Guardian, the, 50, 102, 104
Manchukuo, 95
Manning, Leah, 34
March, Juan, 34
Marconi, Countess, 125
Marlborough-Vanderbilt case, the, 125
Marmol, Tarrida del, 60
Marriage in the Canon Law, 124
Martel, R., 102
Masaryk, President, 76
Matteotti, the murder of, 22
Mecham, Professor, 54
Mein Kampf, 40
Mental Reservation, 8
Mexico and the Vatican, 54
Milyukov, Professor, 11
Mindszenty, Cardinal, 70
Mirdites, the, 25
Montandon, G., 11
Moore, J. F., 112
Morals, clerical, in Germany, 45
in South America, 53
More, Sir Thomas, 123
Moreno, 55
Murray, Dr. Gilbert, 13
Mussolini, 16, 17, 21

Nazi Party, rise of the, 41

O'Conroy, Professor, 93
Osservatore Romano, the, 23, 68, 87, 97
Overy, Sir Esmond, 18

Pacelli, Cardinal, 14, 17, 25
Paderewski, 100
Papal States, brutality in the, 20
plebiscite in the, 21
Papen, F. von, 41
Persecution, religious, 1–5
Pétain, Marshal, 17
Philanthropy, Catholic, 115
Pichon, 95
Pilsudski, Marshal, 103
Poland, persecution in, 101–3
Pombal, 38
Portugal, religion in, 39
Poynter, J. W., 127
Press, Catholic influence on the, 119, 127
Preuss, A., 114
Prieto, C., 39
Public Church Law, 2

Revolution in Spain, 33
Vienna, 63
Revue des Deux Mondes, 95, 97, 103
Revyuk, E., 103
Russia, 9–12
Ryan, Mgr., 120

Salazar, Dr., 39
Salvemini, Professor, 25
Schleicher, General von, 44

Seipel, Mgr., 63
Selden, G., 10
Seyss-Inquart, 17
Sherwood, M., 11
Silesia, plebiscite in, 102
Sing Sing, Catholics in, 113
Slovakia and the Vatican, 75
Smith, Al, 113
Socialism in Germany, 41
Italy, 21
Vienna, 63
Sodomy in German monasteries, 45
Sortain, Fr., 3
Spivak, 103
Starhemberg, 65

Tablet, the, 73
Tammany, 117
Teeling, W., 24
Temporal Power, 51
Thyssen, 41
Times, The, 48
Timperley, H. J., 96
Tiso, Mgr., 73–6
Toleration, Catholic idea of, 23
Torture in modern jails, 65
T'Serclaes, Mgr., 78
Turks, French help to the, 85

Ukrainians, the, 103
Unitarians and culture, 114
Universe, the, 43

Valera, E. de, 78
Vargas, President, 59
Victoria, Catholics of, viii
Vienna, revolt in, 63

Wall Street, 54
Walsh, Fr. E., 12
Wealth of the American Church, 116
Wells, H. G., v
Westminster Catholic Federation, 128
White War, the, 11

The Popes and Their Church

JOSEPH McCABE

A history of the Roman Catholic Church and its rulers, describing the doctrines, practices, and much of the peculiar discipline.

Cheap edition, paper cover, 1*s. net*

The Testament of Christian Civilization

JOSEPH McCABE

"He is now probably the greatest living authority on the history of the Church of Rome. . . . McCabe's book is essential reading for every serious student of history and politics. . . . Everyone who cares for historical truth will be grateful for his courage and scholarship."—FORWARD. 10*s.* 6*d. net*

Twelve Years in a Monastery

JOSEPH McCABE

A vivid description of monastic discipline and the inner life of the Roman clergy, written with fidelity, fairness, and candour from personal experience. *Thinker's Library,* 3*s.* 6*d. net*

Thou Art Peter

A HISTORY OF ROMAN CATHOLIC DOCTRINE AND PRACTICE

A. D. HOWELL SMITH

What does Roman Catholicism teach about the origin and destiny of man? What is the Roman Church's teaching on Marriage, Divorce, Eugenics, and Birth-Control? What is the history of the Religious Orders—monks, nuns, friars, Jesuits, etc.? The answers to these and many associated questions are given in this fascinating and scholarly account of the evolution of Roman Catholic doctrine and practice from the earliest days up to the present.

872 *pp.*, 21*s. net*

★

C. A. WATTS & CO. LTD.

A RATIONALIST ENCYCLOPÆDIA

Joseph McCabe

"Must surely be one of the most remarkable literary achievements of our time, a one-man work of reference, a fair library in a single volume. . . . It contains 1,800 articles on various aspects of religion, philosophy, ethics, and science. . . . This encyclopædia can justly be compared with the best of Wells' work for popular enlightenment."—CAVALCADE

Cheap edition, 10s. 6d. net

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH AGAINST THE TWENTIETH CENTURY

Avro Manhattan

"A well-documented and extremely valuable study of the social and international policy of the organized Church."—TRIBUNE

"The most ambitious treatment of the subject yet attempted in the present century."—HUMANIST (U.S.A.)

"The present cheap edition should place it within reach of many who will be astounded at the subtle workings of this invisible empire."—BOOKS OF TODAY

Cloth, 10s. 6d. net; paper cover, 5s. net

C. A. WATTS & CO. LTD.